DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 189 JC 730 113

AUTHOR	Etchison, James C.
TITLE	An Evaluation of an Innovative Junior College Program for Honor Students.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	134p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Data Analysis; Doctoral Theses; *Honors Classes; *Instructional Innovation; Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Junior Colleges; *Participant Satisfaction; Post Secondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS	Des Moines; *Grand View College; Iowa

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to evaluate an innovative junior college program for honor students at Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. The "Three-Year Program for Superior Students" began in 1970 as an experiment in inter-institutional cooperation with selected four-year institutions in Iowa. Students admitted to the program have been able to take their junior year, in certain major areas of study, at the junior college. Transfer to the cooperating senior institutions has been achieved with no loss of credit. Evaluation of the program was made by asking former participants of the program to rate the instructional, curricular, and honors program of the college, according to a common questionnaire. Supplementary data on the students were obtained from each of the cooperating institutions concerning grade point averages and time required for completion of degrees. The results of the study were based on individual responses to the questionnaires and some interviews, as well as academic records at GVC and the cooperating institutions. The results indicated that former honor students rated GVC very high in terms of curricular and instructional services. The honors program, however, drew criticism in terms of its apparent lack of academic orientation. It was obvious that the program had fulfilled a basic need in the college's total program at one time, but it was not beginning to lose not only its distinctiveness but also its importance to the student. Hence, the final recommendation of the study was that GVC ought to move from an honors program for the select student in the direction of a three year baccalaureate degree. (Author/DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076189

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

AN EVALUATION OF AN INNOVATIVE JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM FOR HONOR STUDENTS

By

James C. Etchison

B.A. University of Illinois, 1967

M.A. University of Toronto, 1968

Ernest D. Nielsen, Ph.D., Advisor
President Emeritus, Grand View College
Des Moines, Iowa

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Walden University
July, 1973

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JAMES C. ETCHISON

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Copyright 1973
by
James C. Etchison

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 15 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 730 113

This study was designed to evaluate an innovative junior college program for honor students at Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa. The "Three-Year Program for Superior Students" began in 1970 as an experiment in inter-institutional cooperation with selected four-year institutions in Iowa. Students admitted to the program have been able to take their junior year, in certain major areas of study, at the junior college. Transfer to the cooperating senior institutions has been achieved with no loss of credit.

Evaluation of the program was made by asking former participants of the program to rate the instructional, curricular, and honors program of the college, according to a common questionnaire. Supplementary data on the students was obtained from each of the cooperating institutions concerning grade point averages and time required for completion of degrees. The results of the study were based on individual responses to the questionnaires and some interviews, as well as academic records at GVC and the cooperating institutions.

The results indicated that former honor students rated GVC very high in terms of curricular and instructional services. The honors program, however, drew some criticism in terms of its apparent lack of academic orientation. It was obvious that the program had fulfilled a basic need in the college's total program at one time, but it was now beginning to lose not only its distinctiveness, but also its importance to the student. Hence, the final recommendation of

the study was that GVC ought to move from an honors program for the select student in the direction of a three-year baccalaureate degree which would be open to more students and which would catapult the institution into a position of educational leadership. Furthermore, the model offered by GVC no longer seemed viable for two-year institutions which might find it to their advantage to go toward the three-year degree.

AN EVALUATION OF AN INNOVATIVE JUNIOR COLLEGE PROGRAM FOR HONOR STUDENTS

By

James C. Etchison

B.A. University of Illinois, 1967

M.A. University of Toronto, 1968

Ernest D. Nielsen, Ph. D., Advisor
President Emeritus, Grand View College
Des Moines, Iowa

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Walden University
July, 1973

Copyright 1973

by

James C. Etchison

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of many people in the preparation of the study. Above all, a special thanks is due the many students who participated in the study by returning their questionnaires and subjecting themselves to unusual interview situations. The assistance of the faculty and administration of Grand View College, especially of Mr. Karl F. Langrock, president, who opened many offices and files to the study, was deeply appreciated.

Four people deserve special recognition. Miss Hiede Haugaard, of the GVC English Department, was invaluable as a proofreader and critic. Dr. Ernest D. Nielsen, president emeritus of Grand View College and advisor to this project, is to be commended for the painstaking care with which he guided the study to its completion. He also deserves special commendation for his foresight and wisdom in developing the program under study. My wife, Ann, without whose love and understanding this project could never have been completed, deserves the return of her husband to the human race and to her side.

Finally, a special thanks must be extended to Bernard L. Turner for his many efforts to bring Walden University into reality and the subsequent amassing of many outstanding individuals from across the nation for the common pursuit of studies in higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i
TABLE OF CONTENTS ii
LIST OF TABLES iv

CHAPTER I: Nature and Scope of the Problem 1
a. Need for institutional research 1
b. Need for evaluative studies 4
c. Importance of the junior college 6
d. The Problem: junior college evaluation 8
e. The Three-Year baccalaureate 10
f. The future of junior colleges 11
g. Purpose of the study 12
h. Definitions of terms used 14
i. Limitations and delimitations 14

CHAPTER II: The College and the Program 16
a. Introduction 16
b. The community 16
c. The college 17
-history 17
-church relationship 19
-educational philosophy 20
d. Institutional profile 23
-admissions 23
-graduates 26
-faculty 29
-students 29
e. The program 32
-background 32
-program today 40
-program requirements 40
-program objectives. 41

CHAPTER III: Design 43
a. population of the study 44
b. statistics 46

CHAPTER IV: Results 47
a. Preliminary analysis 47
b. Services of Faculty Advisors at GVC 51
c. Instruction at GVC 58
d. Curriculum at GVC 71
e. Three-Year program 81

CHAPTER V: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations 95
a. Summary 95
b. Conclusions 98
c. Recommendations 100

APPENDIX A 106

APPENDIX B 108

APPENDIX C 112

APPENDIX D 113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Enrollment statistics, fall figures, 1962-1972 25

Table 2: Degrees conferred, 1962-1972 28

Table 3: Education Beyond Grand View 28

Table 4: Earned degrees held by full-time instructional staff . 31

Table 5: Earned degrees held by part-time instructional staff . 31

CHAPTER 4 TABLES:

4.1: Junior class characteristics, 1970-72 50
4.2: Transfer data, 1970 and 1971 50
4.3: Faculty advising 51
4.4: Unnecessary courses advised 52
4.5: Knowledgeability about major by advisor 53
4.6: Amount of consultation with advisor 54
4.7: Perceptions of advisors on necessary courses 55
4.8: Helpfulness of GVC advisor 57
4.9: GVC background for completing major 58
4.10: Pursuit of same major at four-year college 59
4.11: Three-Year program preparation for transfer 60
4.12: Time-consuming courses at four-year institution . . . 61
4.13: Level of grading at GVC 63
4.14: Quality of instruction at GVC 64
4.15: Personal interest of GVC instructors 65
4.16: Friendlier atmosphere at GVC 66
4.17: Qualifications of GVC instructors 67
4.18: Availability of GVC instructors for help 69
4.19: Sufficiency of GVC course offerings 71
4.20: Course content at GVC 72
4.21: Difficulty in transferring courses 73
4.22: Extra courses at GVC 75
4.23: GVC preparation for major 76
4.24: Course sequence at GVC 77
4.25: Problems in transferring 78
4.26: Benefited from three-year program 81
4.27: Evaluation of weekly seminars 82
4.28: Personal gain from seminars 83
4.29: Encourage others to enter program 84
4.30: Re-enter the program 85
4.31: Academic reasons for entering program 86
4.32: Financial reasons for entering program 87
4.33: Ability to complete degree within one year 89
4.34: Student's gpa as basis for admission 90

4.35: Expansion of the program 91
4.36: Elite status on transfer 92

CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Need for institutional research. Charles Dudley Warner's editorial comment about the weather in 1897 has also held true for institutional research -- everyone has talked about it, but no one has done anything. Moreover, the concluding comment of many books, journal articles, research reports, conference proceedings, and dissertations has been that "more research is needed" (Roueche and Boggs, 1968a). Indeed, the necessity of more research has not been denied, but researchers have avoided asking what type of study is needed.

In an attempt to provide an answer to that question, the prophecy of David Starr Jordan, made in 1929 while discussing the value of the university, provided a useful insight:

> Rightly or wrongly, sooner or later, the American college must give what the students want. The supply must meet the demand or there will be no demand. No doubt, we professors know better what is good for the student than the student himself; but unless we convince him of that, we must let him have, to a great extent, his own way as to what his studies shall be (pp. 11-12).

After the decade of the 1960's, the prophecy became a statement of history. But, for the decade of the 1970's, the statement became a three-fold challenge to every educator concerned with the future of higher education in the United States. First, the field of education needed to become aware of what students wanted, as well as what

society wanted of the students. Second, higher education needed to address itself to those wants, needs, and desires in order to remain a viable institution on the American social and education scene. Third, great efforts needed to be expended to bring into harmony the diverse desires of both students and faculties.

However, such grandiose challenges remained relatively meaningless as long as there continued to exist the dearth of educational research concerning students' wants and the ability of higher education to satisfy such demands. Moreover, recent years have witnessed the growth of such studies in the area of four-year collegiate institutions to the neglect of their sister institutions at the two-year or junior college level. Such factors have been surprising in light of the fact that in 1968 an average of about one-third of all students entering higher education started their programs in junior colleges (Medsker and Tillery, 1971).

The need, however, has not been for more and more statistical computations of national figures with little or no relevance to the individual institution. Rather, concern should have been directed towards increasing our knowledge of individual institutions in terms of their peculiar and specific environments. Unfortunately, it has been in this particular area of institutional research that the demand for knowledge and its absence has been the greatest (Roueche and Boggs, 1968b). While some institutions have provided this type of data for the past fifty years, it ought to be remembered that the greatest amount of research has occurred only in the past decade and

a half (Cowley, 1960).

In 1969, Arthur M. Cohen underscored the necessity of institutional research, particularly in the junior college, when he noted:

> Now that the junior college is fairly launched and has carved a niche in American higher education, calls are being made for research to demonstrate the effectiveness of its program, to help institutional planning, and generally to improve the quality of education received by its enrollees. The Peterson Report (1965, p. 26), a study of California junior colleges, ranked research second only to "improvement of instruction" as a critical need. The report noted particularly that research should be conducted by the institution....as a way of enhancing instruction (pp. 101-102).

Furthermore, O'Connor went beyond Cohen's analysis to suggest a specific type of research as being indispensable to the junior college:

> Follow-up research is as important to the junior college as market research is to a pioneering business. Without the data obtained from such research, it is impossible for junior colleges to respond quickly and effectively to the dynamic forces which shape and change communities and which have such obvious impact on their citizens.
>
> The need for institutional research in the junior college is imperative, perhaps even more so than in the four-year institution. Two-year colleges must be especially sensitive to all sociological and technological changes if they are to meet the needs of business and industry and at once satisfy the requirements of students with a broad range of interests, aspirations, and abilities. Moreover, junior colleges have only two years, sometimes less, in which to make an impact on their students. Follow-up, therefore, is an indispensable aid to vitality, efficiency, and productivity of the institution (1965, pp. 9-10).

However, research which has existed has been of a limited nature

(Roueche and Boggs, 1968b). In a more normative vein, Ikenberry noted that "there is little good research on the instructional process . ." (1967, p. 44). More recently, Van Istendal, commenting on institutional research in the community college, compared the studies of Swanson (1965) and Roueche and Boggs (1968a) and concluded:

> Differences between the findings of these two studies include the more recent Roueche and Boggs study findings of no relationship between type of institutional control, public or private, and research activity, whereas the former Swanson study found public junior colleges to have the more active programs. Also the Roueche and Boggs study found the research category of "students" to receive the most emphasis (42 percent of all reported studies) with least emphasis placed on "instruction" (1.3 percent of all reported studies). Curriculum and programs received second most emphasis with 21 percent of all reported studies being in this category (1970, p. 127).

In summary, Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson have stated, "If the two-year college is to adapt to the changing environment, provide quality education, and evaluate its educational product, well-designed institutional research is essential" (1965m p. 286).

Need for evaluative studies. When administrators have been asked what problems they would like to have researched, "instruction" almost always has ranked high. In one survey, it ranked third behind "students" and "curriculum and programs" (Roueche, 1967). A vast majority of studies of junior college students have related to the success of the transfer student (Roueche and Boggs, 1968b) which reinforced data going back as far as 1928 (Roueche, 1967). However, studies of the transfer student have been continuing (Emrick, 1972) and need to be continued as a means of assessing contemporary junior college programs

and their viability.

In recent years, however, the language has changed so that administrators and faculty members have been confronted with the concept of "accountability." Moreover, as Lieberman has noted, accountability exists "when resources and efforts are related to results in ways that are useful for policy-making, resource allocation, or compensation" (1970, p. 194). In short, accountability has been primarily evaluative research designed to "produce information which can be used in educational decision making" (Astin, 1971, p. 285). The goals have been the same - - to discover whether the outputs of the program, process, or curriculum fit the professed goals of the individual and/or the institution.

Moreover, accountability understood as the assessment of quality has been able to do at least two important things for the institution which has sought to implement its nominal commitment to quality education. First, such an evaluation has provided a ranking of various programs in terms of their relative merit. Such a ranking has distinguished between those programs which needed to be continued or strengthened and those which needed to be abolished. Second, it was possible that programs which fell relatively low in the ranking could be improved with little effort, thus enhancing the overall quality of the institution's program. Programs which were clearly identifiable as substandard and which showed no promise of benefiting either the institution or the individual were then marked for discontinuance (Saupe, 1970).

Importance of the junior college. In October, 1971, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education noted that "the most rapidly growing institutions in American higher education are the two-year colleges and specialized institutes. They accounted for 1,061, or 38 percent, of all institutions and for 28 percent of the students in 1970" (p. 21).

Not only have the statistics been significant, but also the fact has been established that "junior colleges are versatile institutions" (Bright, 1968, p. 23). According to Spencer:

> The junior colleges seem to me to offer our best chance to stimulate genuinely fresh investigations, and then to do something about the answers. Free of the rigid traditions which tie most schools and colleges to their administrative and instructional arrangements, junior colleges can tinker with all sorts of new ideas and put them to work in their classrooms (1967, p. 5).

Historically, junior colleges were established primarily for two reasons. First, a number of institutions emerged which were designed to provide a haven for the study of religion. Many of these institutions later became seminaries to prepare ministers and lay personnel for geographically diverse groups of people having a similar religious and cultural heritage. Other institutions arose to provide an interim education for those who could not enter a university immediately after high school. Most often, the reasons given for this pattern included items such as academic, financial, or personal problems. Possibly, there was also a geographic element which has been overlooked; the early junior colleges maintained a degree of flexibility in terms of courses and calendars which has been unmatched by the universities.

This fact became all the more striking when it was recalled that the rise of junior colleges paralleled the rural growth patterns of the United States from the Civil War to the Second World War. But, whatever the reason for the emergence of the junior college, what was once a trickle of students has now grown into a flood. Medsker and Tillery noted that "nationally, at least one-third of all high school graduates who enter college choose this route, while in Florida and California, this is true of 69 and 80 percent, respectively, of entering students" (1971, pp. 57-58). Gleazer has also noted this impact upon the concept of the junior college:

> Some of its early supporters . . . saw the role of the junior college as limited to providing the first two years of a baccalaureate program, thus relieving the universities of the responsibility of offering the freshman and sophomore years. Many things have happened, however, to alter the nature and aims of a majority of the country's junior colleges. The population has grown rapidly, and the demand for college opportunity has increased in the face of new social and economic needs. Aspirations of Americans have risen as society has become more complex, and as the advantages of education in terms of employment and advancement on the job have become more evident. While the conventional liberal arts and general education programs leading to transfer are still a vital part of the two-year college endeavor, most of the institutions now also emphasize courses of study that will prepare men and women to fill positions immediately in business and industry, government, social service, and other areas essential to the development of the nation. The importance of education to the fulfillment of the individual has also been recognized in the changing pattern of junior college education (1967, pp. 3-4).

Consequently, for many years, the importance of the junior college needed to be recognized on at least two counts. First, by weight of sheer numbers they have firmly established themselves on the American

educational scene. Second, their versatility in education, as well as their utility to people and society, has made them an important focal point in education.

THE PROBLEM

Junior college innovation. It has become commonplace to suggest that American society has entered an age of innovation and experimentation. All across the country, new programs of instruction have been emerging at all levels of education. In 1969, Johnson explored many of the changes in the community colleges while Brick and McGrath were studying innovative trends in the liberal arts colleges, and Dressel was focusing his attention on new trends in undergraduate curricula. By 1972, Berte was able to present a compilation of selected institutional profiles in innovation at the undergraduate level which had occurred in that three-year time span and which tended to demonstrate the pervasive quality of innovation in higher education.

However, if the junior colleges were truly versatile institutions, as has been suggested, what has been studied of their innovation and experimentation? Unfortunately, very little. Johnson concluded in 1967:

> 1. There is increased interest in innovation and experimentation among junior colleges nationally. . . . .
> 2. Experimentation and innovation are less frequently reported in vocational programs than in academic or general education offerings. . . . .
> 3. Experimental colleges -- and this applies alike to senior institutions and to two-year colleges -- tend to be innovative rather than experimental institutions. . . . (p. 17).

Moreover, knowledge about specific innovative programs at the junior college level has escaped the inquiring minds of researchers for many years.

Furthermore, innovation which has taken place has often been difficult to assess in terms of any objective measure. Dressel and DeLisle noted in 1969:

> Much of what passes as innovation is but the hasty adoption of fads. Most educational ideas are not new, though they may seem so to the individual or the institution. Sound innovation comes about when ideas and practices are organized, in new and creative ways, into a coherent whole which promotes student learning. Change on this fundamental base is rare (p. 2).

By 1971, the tone of Dressel's comments had significantly been strengthened:

> Much of what passes as innovation in colleges and universities is really only fadism and tinkering. Changes in requirements, changes in grading practices, freshman seminars, independent study, or alterations in the calendar are often introduced into or grafted onto a program without rethinking the totality of the educational experience and without really modifying the views or the instructional practices of the faculty. Evaluation of the effects of this patchwork approach to innovation is usually sketchy and, in any case, of limited significance because it is impossible to sort out the effects of the patches. They tend to be defended as beneficial rather than being evaluated as a possible element in a coherent total program. Major alterations in the character and impact of higher education are not likely from such patching activity (p. 1).

What was missing in these analyses, however, was the fact that innovation needed to be considered as a relative concept. Very few institutions could ever have been considered innovative in terms of the totality of higher education; however, when the same institutions were

perceived in light of their peculiar environments and histories, innovation and experimentation were often equated with radicalism.

The three-year baccalaureate. One innovative concept which has emerged in recent years has been the idea of a three-year baccalaureate. Educators have been raising serious questions about the traditional structure of the educational experience since William Raney Harper became president of the University of Chicago and tried to establish his "junior and senior colleges" within the university. However, the concerns which have prompted renewed interest in a shortened degree program have been as diverse as they have been numerous. Kirk, in 1960, stated:

> The most insistent problem in higher education today is the necessity to reduce the time spent in preparation for careers. The trend toward specialization and the mounting emphasis on post-graduate work require men and women entering professions to devote nearly half their productive lives to academic instruction before they can begin to support themselves and contribute their knowledge to the public welfare. This is not only an intolerable social and economic waste; it is also deterring many of our ablest students from applying their talents to essential fields (p. 21).

In 1968, Woodring offered the following commentary on the concept:

> By removing all professional specialization from the undergraduate program it would be possible to grant the A.B. degree after three years instead of four and still provide twice as much time for the truly liberal studies as is now available in colleges requiring highly specialized majors and offering professional training (p. 220).

Finally, in January, 1971, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education expanded on this theme to propose a position very similar to that of Woodring. In effect, the educational establishment has been challenged

to rethink the totality of educational experience in the United States and to gear up for a new day.

The future of junior colleges. Assessment of the impact of a three-year baccalaureate on existing junior colleges would be purely hypothetical and beyond the scope of this project. However, the mere introduction of the concept was a primary reason for this particular investigation. The introduction of a shortened time period for earning the first degree will not be without impact upon existing institutions of higher education. As a result, this study began with the recognition of three hypotheses concerning the impact of a shortened degree period on junior colleges:

1. Junior colleges will show no significant change in terms of their numbers and the number of students they attempt to serve.

2. Junior colleges will decline in importance as the universities attract more and more students to the new degree program with a more rapid turnover rate in terms of the number of undergraduates they are able to serve.

3. Junior colleges will increase as they replace the colleges and universities as the agent for granting the new degree.

The first hypothesis suggested that the new degree would have no appreciable effect on junior colleges as they have been constituted. This is certainly plausible where the junior college curriculum has been predominately vocationally oriented. However, if the institution has had a strong tradition of academic preparation and has boasted of highly successful programs of articulation, then it is unlikely that the junior colleges could remain unaffected. As social organisms,

these institutions will be faced with the necessity of adapting to a changing environment.

The second hypothesis suggested that the new degree structure would draw academically oriented students away from the junior colleges, thus enabling those institutions to concentrate their resources on vocational preparation. Since the university would be turning students out in three years as opposed to four, they would be able to handle a greater number of students than was possible earlier. Moreover, financial resources could be distributed to even greater numbers of people so that the financial burden of a university education could be effectively reduced.

The third hypothesis suggested that junior colleges could increase in numbers and in services as they expand their facilities to enable them to offer the third year themselves, thereby not losing their students to the colleges and universities for the first degree. Colleges and universities would then be free to pursue graduate and professional education while the junior colleges would be transformed into the new colleges of the day.

Consequently, junior colleges have the responsibility and the obligation to be abreast of changing times in education. Any movement in higher education has had an effect on the two-year institutions and undoubtedly will continue to do so. Whether the effect was beneficial or harmful has always been dependent on what action was taken by the junior colleges in the United States.

Purpose of the study. In 1969, Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa, instituted a third-year program which was grafted onto the

existing junior college arrangement that had dominated the college since 1925. For the purposes of this study, former participants in the program were asked to rate the instructional, curricular, and honors program to determine how adequately the college had met the needs of those it professed to serve. The basic aim was to secure the judgment of students and transfer institutions as an aid to assist in determining the merit of the program. With the new emphasis on a three-year baccalaureate degree, it is possible the program may someday be seen in retrospect as a transitional project prior to the institution of a baccalaureate degree. Little institutional research has been done at Grand View College and none has been undertaken since a non-comprehensive alumni survey was completed in 1969. The results of the research were desired by the faculty and administration of the college, the cooperating institutions, as well as the accrediting association.

Since the program was generally conceded to be a unique experiment, there is little to report in the way of related research. Chapter II, therefore, will be concerned with presenting an institutional profile of Grand View College, emphasizing its unique cultural heritage and the contribution of that heritage to the program. Moreover, the same chapter will also discuss the major features of the program in terms of professed goals as well as its realities. The research design, the population surveyed, the instruments designed, and the employment of the instruments are discussed in Chapter III. The results of the study follow in Chapter IV. The conclusions, summary, and recommendations for Grand View College may be of use to other educational institutions and

are presented in Chapter V.

Definitions of terms used. As used in this paper, the three terms listed below shall be interpreted and defined as follows:

1. articulation. The process which provides a more or less continuous flow of students between educational institutions (Kintzer, 1970, p. 1).

2. curriculum. All the courses, irrespective of credit, offered by Grand View College as listed in its current catalog.

3. junior college. In an unqualified sense, junior college is often regarded as a generic designation for all institutions that offer two-year college programs (Hillway, 1958, p. 8; Thornton, 1966, p. 73). However, in this study, the more limited definition of junior college will be used to mean a "two-year college, often privately controlled, which concentrates primarily on preparing its students to transfer to four-year colleges to pursue the bachelor's degree" (Thornton, 1966, p. 73).

Limitations and delimitations. The research was limited to the services performed as regards curricular, instructional, and honors services specifically for the participants in the three-year program at Grand View College.

While the college has enjoyed a fine reputation for its high rate of very successful transfer students, it was not the purpose of this study to assess the total transfer program but only that portion which distinguishes Grand View College from hundreds of similar institutions throughout the United States. It was further limited to the responses by and success of these particular third-year students, including grade

point averages and other information pertaining to their achievements at their transfer institutions. The ultimate gauge of success for the program can only be in terms of individual student successes.

CHAPTER II

THE COLLEGE AND THE PROGRAM

Introduction. Grand View College (GVC), a two-year, co-educational, liberal arts college, located in Des Moines, Iowa, has been owned and operated by the Lutheran Church in America. Founded in 1896 by the Danish Lutheran Church in America, the school was originally conceived of as a Danish University in America. Like the parent church body, the college over the years, had to undergo the difficult process of Americanization without, however, sacrificing any of its basic educational and religious ideals. In its early years, the college trained men for service in the church, and until 1930, it was bilingual. An academy, established in 1912, was the primary department of instruction until 1925 when education along junior college lines was formally introduced. In 1936 the academy was discontinued, and in 1958 the junior college became accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (NCA). In 1968 a new and unique "Three-Year Program" was introduced. Four years later, GVC celebrated its 75th Anniversary as an educational institution which had been in continuous operation since its original founding.

The Community. Historically, GVC has served the city of Des Moines very much in the capacity of a community college. Until 1968, there were no publicly supported junior colleges in the immediate vicinity of the city. Although Drake University, a private institution, has provided a two-year program for Des Moines residents, it has been

at a substantially higher cost than GVC. By 1972, however, the educational marketplace had become quite competitive.

Des Moines, according to the 1970 census, had a population of 201,404 or 14 percent of the state's total population. The greater metropolitan area has supported three institutions of higher learning--GVC, Drake University, and a new community college. Moreover, Des Moines is located 30 miles from the State University of Iowa; 65 miles from Iowa University; 20 miles from Simpson College; and 45 miles from Central College. The general decline of student enrollments in higher education, coupled with the increased competitive nature of the institutions throughout Iowa, has caused GVC to seriously rethink its own raison d'etre.

THE COLLEGE

History. The history of GVC has been told in several publications, and it would not warrant extensive treatment here (Hansen, 1972; Nielsen, 1962). Nevertheless, a few historical comments seemed worthy of inclusion to emphasize the varied perspectives which created GVC.

By 1877, the role of the Danish Lutheran Church in America in education was sufficiently clarified to provide the broad themes which were later to create GVC. It was clear from the church convention at Neenah, Wisconsin, in the preceding year, that the church membership had grown to substantial proportions and was scattered through the Midwestern states. One of the primary topics at that convention was Højskolen, i.e., the folk high school.

The decision to have such a school had already been made; it was

then more a question of ownership. On November 1, 1878, the Danish Lutherans of Elk Horn, Iowa, opened a proprietary folk school based on the classical Danish model. Two years later, the Elk Horn school became the property of the church. An ensuing struggle over the role of the school as a seminary became a point of contention at subsequent conventions of the church. Finally, in 1886, the general convention at Cedar Falls, Iowa, voted to establish a separate facility at West Denmark for the preparation of men for the ministry.

The church's third step in the educational field came with the establishment of Grand View College in 1896. According to Nielsen,

> In its genesis, the new school in Des Moines is quite unlike the schools at Elk Horn and West Denmark. It is not conceived of as a folk high school, but as an institution of higher education for future pastors, but general education for the youth of the church. In this respect, the new co-educational school is different from either Elk Horn or West Denmark. Where each of the two schools, Elk Horn and West Denmark, operated exclusively with a single program in each school, folk high school in the one and theological education in the other, Grand View embarks from the very outset on a broader base and higher educational level. The general education curriculum is ready by the opening of the school in 1896. Theological education is not offered until the following year, 1897 (1962, p. 3).

The history of GVC for the next few years was also the history of internal struggling within the church. With the election of Pastor Thorvald Knudsen in 1912 as the fourth president of the college, the movement to create a Danish folk high school out of GVC reached its zenith. It was not until 1923-24 that the college sought to assert itself as an institution of higher education. The steps were slow

and sometimes painful as the church made the transition, although the Synod Board had authorized the creation of a junior college in 1921. With an adequate faculty and staff, GVC began offering junior college instruction in 1925.

However, new institutions have never been without their growing pains, and hopes for early accreditation were soon dashed. Oddly enough, it was precisely those people in the church who had been working toward the establishment of a Danish folk high school that led the battle against accreditation. Their position was that credits, grades, and examinations became ends in themselves. Moreover, there was a certain apprehension about interference by external agencies, such as the State Department of Public Instruction -- a fear which was also common in Denmark during the previous century.

Slowly and painfully, the faculty and administration of GVC confronted the task of providing a dual system of education -- one directed towards its students and the other directed toward the church itself. In 1958, the battle for accreditation was won, but not without many sacrifices along the way. Yet, the early history of GVC left an indelible mark upon the character of the institution as it prepared to enter the last half of the twentieth century. As Nielsen noted, "In my judgment the concern on the part of the Danish folk high schools for general enlightenment and freedom is their greatest contribution" (1962, p. 9).

The Church Relationship. The merger of the United Lutheran Church, the Augustana Lutheran Church, the Suomi Synod, and the American Evangelical Lutheran Church was completed in 1962, resulting in the

Lutheran Church in America. Undoubtedly, the merger of these major strands of the Lutheran Church marked a new chapter in the history of GVC.

Structurally, GVC was established as a college of the Iowa Synod of the LCA in 1963. The Board of College Education and Church Vocation (LCA), which has been responsible for all educational institutions within the church, recommended that GVC be related to both the Illinois and Iowa Synods, effective 1967. In essence, this move meant that the college received primary financial support from the Iowa Synod and secondary support from the Illinois Synod -- a move which reinforced the college's past history of continuously operating in the black.

Educationally, the merger has brought the leaders of the colleges of the church into closer relationship with one another. Moreover, it has had the additional benefit of increasing inter-institutional cooperation among academic programs and facilities.

Educational Philosophy. According to the college catalog, GVC has defined its educational purposes by seeking:

> -to show educational and Christian concern for the advancement of the individual student as a human being by helping him gain a fuller realization of his own mental, moral, physical, and social aptitudes, abilities, and interests;
>
> -to provide broad intellectual experience of high academic quality so that the students may be prepared for contemporary living and for participation as a mature citizen in our dynamic culture;
>
> -to provide educational opportunities suited to student of different backgrounds, abilities, and goals;

> -to help the student prepare himself for a profession or occupation through courses leading to further study in a senior college, or in a professional or technical school;
>
> -to render educational services to the churches and to the community (1972-74, pp. 10-11).

Moreover, according to the visiting team of the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association, "the college quite successfully accomplishes this end" (1962, p. 2).

Dr. Ernest D. Nielsen, president of the college from 1952 until his retirement in 1972, has imbued the college with a sense of preparing students for further education. He has been consistently opposed to the suggestion that the junior college in any way provided a "terminal" educational program. He has, in fact, maintained that the use of the term in the literature of junior colleges has actually done much to undermine their role and function. With this thought in mind, GVC has consistently avoided becoming involved with terminal programs by confining its attention to strengthening its liberal arts programs.

Central to the philosophy of the college has been the need to attempt to bridge the gap between high school and college. Hence, a significant part of its efforts has been directed toward salvaging students who failed to perform to their full capacity while in high school. As the visiting team of the North Central Association noted in March, 1969:

> The institution has built up a program of liberal arts studies with an orientation quite different from the usual public community college curricula. The college does not choose to develop vocational programs and students and faculty support this position.

> In essence, Grand View College is primarily a single purpose institution with characteristics similar to a four-year liberal arts college. There is no doubt but that its principal function remains one of providing two years of academic studies comparable to the first two years of a baccalaureate program at a four-year college (p. 2).

Consequently, admissions policies at GVC have purposely been kept fluid to encourage students to attempt some college-level work.

Moreover, as the visiting team's report also noted, "Within the context of its curricular goals, Grand View College's programs of instruction are, for the most part adequate or excellent" (p. 4). A number of arrangements have been constructed to significantly broaden the spectrum of possibilities for students of widely differing abilities, interests, and aptitudes. Recently, three degrees and a certificate have been offered by GVC: the Associate of Arts degree (A.A.), the Associate of Liberal Arts degree (A.L.A.), the junior college diploma, and the Three-Year Certificate.

The A.L.A. program was designed primarily for college transfer students and reflected the feeling of the faculty about how goals should be achieved through a general education background. The A.A. program was developed for the student wishing to gain an educational background with a minimal degree of breadth while still providing the opportunity for the development of majors. The Junior College Diploma was developed for the student whose major is so restrictive that a more liberal course of study would jeopardize completion of a degree within four years. The Three-Year Certificate was designed to recognize students who completed the college's "Three-Year Program," which is

jointly decided upon by GVC and a cooperating four-year institution in which the baccalaureate degree may be earned through an additional year of study.

Institutional Profile. The preceding comments regarding the history and philosophy of GVC, while interesting, have presented a far from adequate summary of the institution. Therefore, in order to complete the relevant background information, it was necessary that some summary be made of the institution as it stood when this project was being completed. Four areas appeared to warrant specific attention: admission, graduates, faculty, and students.

a. Admissions. According to the 1972-74 catalog of the college, admission standards for the freshman applicant have been developed along lines that "the applicant should be a graduate of an accredited high school, and give evidence of the ability to do satisfactory college work. One who does not meet these entrance requirements may contact the Admissions Office for further counsel" (p. 16). However, admission as a special student has been an available option for those who have failed to qualify under this standard. Usually, the special student would have been asked to submit a G.E.D. test score in order to have the normal requirements waived. Fall semester enrollment figures have been summarized in Table 1 for the decade 1962-72. It has been a significant trend for GVC that while the total number of students during the decade has shown some degree of flexibility, the number of juniors admitted to the college's program has increased relative to the remainder of the student body. Similarly, even though GVC has not had a selective admissions policy, there has been a rather

consistent mean ACT score for new freshmen, since that test became part of the college's requirements in 1968.

TABLE 1: ENROLLMENT STATISTICS, FALL FIGURES 1962-1972

	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
Full-time	667	539	674	917	1,039	1,004	1,027	1,051	977	850	665
Part-time	175	425	352	360	382	454	517	517	486	364	160
Male students	588	691	700	882	979	997	997	997	902	749	475
Female students	254	273	326	395	442	461	517	571	561	465	350
TOTAL	842	964	1,026	1,277	1,421	1,458	1,544	1,568	1,463	1,214	825
Freshman**	523 (62)*	573 (59)	662 (65)	688 (54)	801 (56)	1,018 (70)	1,067 (69)	1,049 (67)	936 (64)	739 (61)	524 (63)
Sophomores	319 (38)	391 (51)	364 (35)	423 (46)	620 (44)	440 (30)	477 (31)	515 (33)	508 (35)	450 (37)	271 (33)
Juniors								4 (0.3)	19 (1.3)	25 (2)	25 (3)
Special											5
Mean ACT scores							20.8	21.4	21.7	20.2	20.3

*figures in parentheses are percentages

**first enrollment in any course

b. Graduates. GVC has attempted to provide a number of viable alternatives to serve its diverse student population. Accordingly, three degree structures have emerged in recent years to provide the student with flexibility in terms of occupational or career goals and aspirations. Table 2 summarizes the number of degrees awarded over the decade 1962-72.

By far, the most common degree has been the standard junior college diploma which is the least restrictive of the degrees available. While the theory has been that the diploma will afford the greatest leeway in pursuit of career goals, it has been an option most often taken by the student who has been uncertain of his academic future or who has failed to earn credit in certain courses required for the other degree structures.

While the Associate of Liberal Arts degree was first offered in 1965, it was not until 1968 that any students availed themselves of this option. The degree contained a number of required courses which reflected the faculty's concern for a general liberal arts education.

The Associate of Arts degree has been utilized primarily as it was intended -- a degree which permits the transfer student to have minimal breadth in the liberal arts and yet an opportunity to begin to develop major programs in order to attain career goals and individual aspirations.

According to the 1968 Alumni Survey conducted by the college, GVC graduates have consistently pursued careers requiring more education beyond Grand View. Their findings are summarized in Table 3. Furthermore, there has been every indication that the number of students

pursuing advanced education has been increasing since 1968. Unfortunately, there were no available statistics to substantiate this trend. Nevertheless, conversations with individual students have led to this conclusion. Moreover, since 1968 the faculty has been in agreement that even though objective measures of student ability have remained constant, individual motivation has increased.

TABLE 2: DEGREES CONFERRED, 1962-1972

DEGREE	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
A.A.	20	20	6	18	29	14	20	32	36	62	69
A.L.A.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	3
Diploma	62	68	75	46	55	47	60	59	64	86	75
Certif.	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	4	16	18
Totals	82	88	81	64	84	61	81	91	106	167	165

SOURCE: Office of Admissions, Grand View College

TABLE 3: EDUCATION BEYOND GRAND VIEW

CLASSES	Respondents	Bachelor's	Master's	Ph.D.s-M.D.,etc.
1896-1919	16	2	2	0
1920-1929	18	4	3	1
1930-1939	29	9	4	2
1940-1949	123	65	30	5
1950-1959	350	202	46	8
1960-1967	492	179	19	2
TOTAL:	1,028 (25%)	461 (45%)	104 (10.1%)	18 (1.7%)

SOURCE: Grand View College. Alumni Survey. March, 1969. Des Moines, Iowa, p. 19. Based upon 4000 questionnaires which were mailed to GVC alumni.

c. Faculty. For the 1972-73 school year, GVC has a faculty of 38 full-time members; 19 part-time instructors; and two librarians with faculty status. Three of the faculty have earned doctorates,and three others were candidates for the degree. Only five faculty members had less than a Master's degree. Tables 4 and 5 summarize faculty degrees for both the full-time and part-time staff.

Moreover, all faculty members have been assigned teaching responsibilities in the areas of their primary degrees. Furthermore, the student-faculty ratio at GVC has consistently been a source of the college's strength in appealing to new students. Class size has averaged about 25 students, although some classes have existed with as few as seven students.

d. Students. Students at GVC have not varied from the classic description offered by Cross (1968) with the possible exception of the fact that GVC students have had a relatively higher academic standing than that which has traditionally been associated with the junior college. Table 1 provided the mean ACT score for entering freshmen since 1968. It has been in this respect that the college has noted certain affinities with the four year institutions, particularly with what the Carnegie Commission has called, "the invisible colleges" (Austin, 1972).

In terms of socio-economic characteristics, the GVC student has been reflective of the society from which he was drawn. Both extremes of the socio-economic scale have been represented at GVC; however, the vast majority of the students have been drawn from the middle class to the lower middle class background. Largely, this has been a direct

result of the fact that for many years GVC offered a quality education with a relatively low cost factor, at least in comparison with the major private universities in and around the city of Des Moines.

TABLE 4: EARNED DEGREES HELD BY FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

RANK	Total	Number whose highest earned degree is:					
		Doctors	Ph.D.Candidate	Masters	Bachelors	Other	Specialist
Prof.	5	1		4			
Assoc.	5		1	4			
Asst.	25	1	2	20	1	1	
Instr.	3				3		
Total:	38	2	3	28	4	1	

TABLE 5: EARNED DEGREES HELD BY PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

RANK	Total	Number whose highest earned degree is:					
		Doctors	Ph.D.Candidate	Masters	Bachelors	Other	Specialist
Prof.	2	1		1			
Assoc.	0						
Asst.	2			2			
Instr.	15			8	7		
Total:	19	1	0	11	7		

THE PROGRAM

Background. While GVC was waging its battle for accreditation, Dr. Ernest D. Nielsen, then president of the college, prepared a memorandum for the faculty and the Board of Directors regarding the possibility of expanding the college's education program. In January, 1958, the ideas were formalized in a paper, "A Challenging Opportunity: An Action Program," which raised a number of questions about the gifted student in the first two years of college and which suggested that a special program might be added as an adjunct to the summer and evening division of the college for those students.

For two years, Dr. Nielsen wrestled with the problem of the gifted student and the junior college. One of the first people he consulted about such a project was Dr. C. Arild Olsen, then Executive Secretary for the National Council of Churches of Christ and a former president of GVC. The letter, dated December 27, 1960, reads in part:

> If you will permit me to convey a few more thoughts with which I am struggling, I think that some foundation ought to come along to give a private two-year college a five year grant to experiment with a three-year program. . . not for every student, but for a group large enough to be tested. Then the program should be related to a few select universities which would agree to cooperate. . . . the students should then transfer, at the end of the third year, either to the divisional level (as at the University of Chicago) or to the professional schools. If we would set up a three year liberal education program (excluding pre-professional courses), there is no reason to believe that we could not do an excellent job. In my book, this kind of program leading to earlier admission to the graduate school -- not for the purpose of shortening the course, but for the sake of really learning how to undertake graduate work and research giving the student

> actually one more year at this level -- is more valuable than early admission to college (i.e. from high school). [During] the first two years I should want to see the first year as strictly foundational; the second year the student would begin to know what he wants to do, and the work at the foundational level should be broadened. . . the third year should be one of concentration and integration (with a large degree of responsibility placed upon the student himself.)

Dr. Olsen's reply was primarily concerned with developing two questions: (1) Can a two-year college really offer a liberal education? and (2) Is the teaching in a two-year college on a high level? In brief, the concern was whether or not the college had an adequate faculty to become involved in such a program -- more than just an experiment, but a whole new concept in junior college education.

Impetus was given to the proposal when GVC was invited to participate in the Junior College Dean's Conference, January 9, 1961, at Iowa State University. The engineering department presented a paper, "Engineering at ISU," which indicated that it might be possible to have a three-year professional period for engineering students after the completion of basic courses which would last from one to two years and which could be carried on at a junior college.

In February, 1961, Dr. Nielsen prepared another paper for the faculty and Board of Directors of the college, "The Prospect for Educational Advancement in the Years Ahead." After reviewing the current trends in education and noting the enormous growth of state-supported institutions and the relative decline of the private colleges and universities, Dr. Nielsen proposed a number of items for breaking away from conventionalism in higher education. Chief among the proposals was the concept of a three-year program, based upon a somewhat

novel and distinct view of liberal education:

> Basic to my own thinking on the subject of a liberal education is the thesis: that the criterion of a liberal arts college is not primarily the length of the program. A genuine liberal arts program is one where the liberal arts and professional segments are differentiated; it is, educationally speaking, a program which rests upon the assumption, that we know where collegiate education ends and professional begins. Personally, I believe that is is possible for a superior student to acquire a truly liberal education in preparation for graduate and professional studies in less than four years. I am not speaking of accelerating the student's program by one year. I am advocating an educational experiment on the ground that. . . graduate work will expand in the years ahead and require a quality of instruction and emphasis on research, which will necessitate a re-examination of our course offerings at the undergraduate level. I would advocate that we would do a better job in our graduate and professional schools, if we extended their program by one year . . . starting such work at the end of the third year in college, provided, of course, that the instruction in each of the three years had contributed significantly to the liberal education of the students preparing for graduate work.

Moreover, great pains were taken to point out that the proposal differed in at least two respects from similar plans. First, there was no advocacy of a Baccalaureate degree based upon the fact that such a degree often implied a terminal education, and the central concept here was to be one of "continuing education." Second, an accelerated program was avoided because serious questions existed as to whether or not students had sufficient maturity and insight to gain significantly from accelerated course work.

Furthermore, the program as envisioned would be undertaken by phases which would correspond to the academic year. In the first phase,

or year, the student would be introduced to the foundational courses of a liberal education. The second year, or phase, would be concerned with broadening the foundation, while the third would be devoted to concentration and integration. Dr. Nielsen formally proposed that, hopefully, the program could be initiated in the first semester of the 1962-63 academic year.

However, funds to help underwrite the costs of the program were not as readily available as it had been hoped they would be, and not all of the graduate schools responded favorably to the proposal. In March, 1962, the visiting team of the North Central Association recommended that "perhaps the President's plan should be examined by a larger body and its strengths and weaknesses more precisely determined."

Dr. Nielsen spent the remainder of 1962 trying to secure support for the program from various sources. In May, 1962, he approached Dr. Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who responded with sympathy but nothing else. Finally, on August 10, 1962, Dr. Nielsen prepared for the faculty and Board of Directors of the college, another paper, "The Three-Year Plan," which stressed that:

> We must cease being obsessed by the fixed idea that undergraduate education is either two or four years. Higher education, i.e. education beyond the high school, whether academically, professionally, or occupationally oriented, will have to be carried on in a diversity of patterns and on a continuing basis in the years ahead (p. 12).

Still, there was no money to implement the program. From 1962 until

October, 1965, Dr. Nielsen's energies were consumed in attempting to find foundational support for the program, and as a consequence, the proposal lay dormant.

However, Dr. Nielsen was invited to speak at the Phi Delta Kappa meeting in conjunction with the Annual Convention of the Iowa State Education Association held in Des Moines, Iowa, on October 22, 1965. For this august gathering, Dr. Nielsen's address, "The Private Junior College in the Face of Educational Change: What Can We Make of It?" noted the changes which were taking place in higher education and suggested that the time required for a Bachelor's degree be shortened by one year to more clearly distinguish between college and university work. Moreover, the success of the program, according to Dr. Nielsen, would largely be dependent upon the amount of inter-institutional cooperation the undergraduate institution could establish with the participating schools.

The significant point here was that there was a noticeable shift in Dr. Nielsen's thinking. He apparently moved from the area of being concerned simply about the superior student whose goals clearly demanded a graduate education to the student who merely sought a liberal education at the undergraduate level. The position was more explicitly stated in a letter from Dr. Nielsen to Dr. Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, on November 12, 1965:

> The underlying rationale is: (1) The explosion of knowledge, and (2) continuing education. The explosion of knowledge gives a new urgency to the need for curricula which <u>instead</u> of aiming at completing a man's education would, on the contrary, give him the best possible foundation for his own continuing education. Hence, since edu-

> cation in the world today is interminable, the proposal is to shorten the time for the first degree and spend more time on the second degree without lengthing the total number of years. Hopefully, the outcome would be two fold: (1) A much clearer distinction between college and university, and (2) three years for a Master's Degree which ought to make both that degree and graduate studies leading up to it more meaningful. I think this is an objective which can be realized. Personally, I believe that if the experiments were successful, the result would be a significant contribution to strengthening higher education.

A week later, administrative officers from GVC and the University of Iowa met at Iowa City to discuss implementation of the program. While a discussion of the transfer of credits occupied a major portion of the meeting, it was agreed either examination or validation would be sufficient until the program had the necessary accreditation. It was also suggested that it might be possible to grant a degree for the program, possibly a Bachelor of General Education which would permit the universities to grant an A.B. or B.S. at the same time the M.A. would be awarded.

Never relenting, Dr. Nielsen continued to seek outside support for the program from foundations and industries, as well as from the educational establishment itself. In December of 1965, Dr. Nielsen received support from Edmund J. Gleazer, the Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges and a former president of Graceland College in Lamoni, Iowa:

> I would certainly encourage experimentation of the kind you describe. One of our great problems at the present is that our educational structure does not seem very tolerant of innovation. Both the regional associations and the constituents of a college want to know whether the institution

> is a four-year college, and if you do not fit neatly into one of those categories, the problem of interpretation is difficult. So I would certainly like to see tried the kind of program you describe.

Similar responses were also received from such distinguished scholars as Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and a former president of the Claremont Colleges for Men.

In March, 1966, Dr. Nielsen finally appeared before the Iowa Synod of the Lutheran Church in America to inform them of the new program:

> No single institution is unaffected by change. No two institutions need to be alike. Grand View College is not only undergoing change, but it is deliberately experimenting with new concepts oriented towards establishing a three-year program (alongside its two year program) which will be quite distinctive in its emphasis on academic quality and unique in inter-institutional cooperation.

At the pre-opening faculty conference, September, 1966, Dr. Nielsen presented the program to the faculty and challenged them to create the courses and course sequences necessary to insure the success of the program.

Part of the program, as it was conceived, would be a seminar type of experience, the sole aim of which would be the "integration of knowledge" for the students. Dr. Nielsen did the preliminary work on this part of the program by suggesting that sixteen two-hour sessions each semester during the third year would be a viable vehicle for integrating the various participating disciplines so that the student would be subjected to a new type of learning situation rather than simply

amassing new information. Hence, he believed that it would be unnecessary for "busy-work" to be involved in this experience; however, that needed to be worked out with the coordinator and the participating faculty members.

In January, 1967, Dr. Nielsen continued his search for outside support by formally presenting to the U. S. Commissioner of Education a proposal for a research grant of $10,500, for a three year period. Basically, the grant would have covered part of the salary for the coordinator and additional faculty members who would be necessitated by the addition of the third year to the college's program. The request was simply denied.

However, outside support began to manifest itself in non-financial ways. In October, 1967, Dr. Nielsen received the following letter from Dr. Norman Burns of the North Central Association:

> The North Central Association has no objection to the experiment in interinstitutional cooperation that is being initiated between Grand View College and the three state universities of Iowa.
>
> You are free to report the position of the North Central Association in your final progress report to the Presidents of the three universities and to your Board of Directors.
>
> We wish you every success in this experiment.

Finally, as though history does indeed come full circle, Dr. Nielsen wrote to Dr. C. Arild Olsen in November, 1967, conveying these sentiments of the North Central Association and pointing out a major modification in the original concept of the program:

> Originally, I thought that the program might be limited to a three or four year period of experimentation. However, Presidents Bowen and Parks [of Iowa University and Iowa State

> University, respectively] both felt that a test of this program should be extended to six years so as to enable the universities to determine the value of this program, not only for Grand View but also for the universities. It was not part of our conception that students should enter this program unless they were destined for the Master's Degree. Here, the deans of each of the three universities [the University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Northern Iowa] felt that we were in error, and encouraged us not to bar qualified students for this program even if they were to decide to terminate their education at the level of the Bachelor's Degree.

Consequently, the "Three-Year Program for Superior Students" was formally added to the college in the fall semester, 1968.

The Program Today. Although the program was originally designed for students in English, history, sociology, and biology, available majors have been expanded to include also political science, education, and speech. Moreover, while the program began as an experiment in inter-institutional cooperation with the three state universities in Iowa, it has been expanded to include Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa; Simpson College in Indianola, Iowa; and Dana College, at Blair, Nebraska. Since the program began, GVC has not been actively recruiting cooperating four-year institutions; on the contrary, the additions which have been made (and are currently being negotiated) are a result of those institutions wanting to become involved in the program.

Program Requirements. Application for admission to the program needed the approval of the Director of Admissions and the Three-Year Program Committee, which is composed of the faculty members from each of the participating disciplines. Any one of three criteria may be

used for admission:

1. That the student has graduated from high school in the upper 15 percent of his class; or
2. That the student has graduated in the upper 25 percent of his high school class, provided that he has attained a standard score of 26 or above on college bound norms of the American College Test (ACT); or
3. That the student has completed one year at Grand View College, with a B average, or better.

Continuation in the program is dependent upon the student's maintaining a B average, and his progress is reviewed annually by the faculty committee involved. Moreover, during his third year, the student must participate satisfactorily in the Honor's Seminar, for which credit is given within his major.

Program Objectives. The objectives of the program have been developed primarily with regard to the educational development of the student, as opposed to the institution. First, the program was designed to prepare "carefully selected students to enter upon a course of studies with concentration" in one of the participating disciplines. Second, the program had as a primary objective the development of "a high degree of articulation between college and university." This would be accomplished through inter-institutional cooperation, "combining the college's primary emphasis on teaching with the university's standing as research institution."

Beyond the personal objectives, the program was also expected to make certain other contributions. It would:

1. Offer a significant example of inter-institutional cooperation between private and public higher education;
2. Demonstrate the feasibility and capability of the academically strong private two-year college to

evolve a unique program;

3. Provide the first attempt to explore whether a strong junior college offering a three-year program for able students can provide the cooperating universities with well-qualified candidates who otherwise might not have the opportunity for upper division and graduate work;
4. Contribute to the fullest utilization of excellent facilities;
5. Provide the academically talented high school student, who starts his college education in a junior college, with the maximum opportunity to proceed to the Master's Degree;
6. Set a pattern within the junior college movement, not in opposition to the vocational and technical community or junior colleges, but as institutions oriented toward academically able students who should be encouraged to do graduate work.

The remainder of this research was devoted to ascertaining whether or not the various objectives, both individual as well as institutional, were met.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN

It has already been indicated that research pertinent to the problems of this study has simply been lacking, unless one wanted to travel well-trodden ground and use traditional articulation studies. However, a review of some of the research literature in the first chapter indicated that there has existed relatively little material on institutional research, particularly concerning the instructional, curricular, and honors services of the junior college. Furthermore, evaluation of existing programs of instruction for Honors Students has been nearly as non-existent as the programs themselves. Innovation, by definition, has needed constant reassessment from all segments in order to satisfy the institution and its student constituents that its functional utility can be justified and perhaps even extended.

Moreover, since the program under study in this project has generally been conceded as a unique experiment in providing new educational alternatives for the superior student in the junior college, it was apparent that much of the research design could not follow prepared blueprints. Instead, it was decided that a highly individualized design would be necessary to assist the institution in evaluating its own program. As Medsker forewarned:

> Any institution must always bear close examination and evaluation. With the eyes of the nation now on the junior college, it is doubly important to describe it accurately -- both its weaknesses and its merits. The purpose of such an evaluation is not to condemn the institution or to reduce its effectiveness, but to assist it in rendering even greater service (1960, p. 27).

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The student population of this study consisted of forty-eight students, twenty-four males and twenty-four females. The students were all participants in the Three-Year Honors Program at Grand View College, during the years 1970, 1971, and 1972. Ten of the participants did not receive certificates indicating their full participation in the program. The majority of these students did not maintain the grade point average required of participants in the program (a "B" average), while others, by their own choice, simply did not remain for a full year (i.e., two semesters) in the program.

Preliminary research on the forty-eight students was conducted by using their permanent records at the college and a letter and questionnaire to their transfer institutions (see Appendix A) which sought limited statistical data regarding grade point averages and time spent at the transfer institution. Grades were available only for students in the classes of 1970 and 1971. Within this group of twenty-three students, one female did not continue her education because of family health problems and one female took only six hours beyond GVC during the early months of her pregnancy (her GVC cumulative grade point average was 3.54, and her six hours of transfer work earned a 4.0). Since the study was concerned with full-time

students, twenty-one students constituted the population for the purpose of computing grade point averages.

While the cooperating institutions were providing the requested information, each of the forty-eight participants was sent a questionnaire seeking his (or her) personal responses to thirty-four questions which had been grouped into four general sections -- concerning faculty advisors, instruction, curriculum, and the Three-Year Program. The rating scale had three choices -- disagree, undecided, and agree. The rating scale, an answer sheet, and a cover letter were mailed to each of the forty-eight participants. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included in the mailing for their convenience. The letter, which sought to explain the purpose of the survey and research as well as the questionnaire may be found in Appendix B.

Although the questionnaires were returned anonymously, some individuals felt compelled to append individual letters indicating their reasons for certain responses. These letters were then stapled to the answer sheets to assist the researcher in the compilation of total responses. In addition to the questionnaires and rating scale, several personal interviews were conducted with the transfer students for additional comments and information; the results of these interviews were used both in the final analysis and in the recommendations of Chapter Five.

STATISTICS

From the answer sheets returned by the students, the responses to the rating scale were coded on a master sheet. From this, a distribution analysis of responses was obtained, which employed nine variables: total response, male response, female response, graduate response, participant response, male graduate response, female graduate response, male participant response, female participant response. Collectively, they were summarized in Appendix C.

A separate table was used for each statement rated in order to analyze the number and percentage of students, as distributed above, who responded to each item. For each statement and table, a summary with implications was used to describe the analysis which is included in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis. Table 4.1 provided a capsulized statement regarding GVC participants in the "Three-Year Program for Superior Students." The categories were constructed to permit demonstration of variations within particular class years as well as a composite picture.

Table 4.2, however, attempted to provide follow-up data for students in the classes of 1970 and 1971 according to the questionnaires returned by the cooperating institutions (see Appendix A). A number of items appeared to warrant further explanation.

First. While the transfer means grade point average (GPA, with 4.0 equal to "A") has decreased, the decrease was not as large as might have been expected. The only available major study of Iowa transfer students covered the period of June, 1953, to March, 1955, and was correlated between various types of institutions of higher education with the three state institutions. Students from private junior colleges averaged a net loss in mean GPA of 0.30; however, they did account for the highest percentage of students eventually receiving degrees (Medsker, 1960, p. 336). A study of table 4.2 indicated that GVC has made tremendous advances in providing student articulation with no appreciable GPA loss for its honor students.

Second. The same Medsker study also indicated that the greatest

single loss in GPA occurred when the private junior college student enrolled at the State University of Iowa (p. 336). The data obtained on the one transfer student from GVC to the State University in 1970 substantiated the earlier finding. In 1955, the average loss was 0.43; for the GVC student in 1970, it was 0.36. While one case could not indicate a statistically significant fact, it was, nevertheless, an interesting phenomenon.

Third. Of the four students in the class of 1970, two transferred and completed their degrees in less than two semesters, which had been the expected norm. No explanation has been obtained from those involved, and college records indicated there was no course overload. One interpretation, however, could have been than the level of preparation and mastery was sufficient to permit the students to have normal college requirements waived.

Fourth. Students in the class of 1971 have, on the whole, taken longer to complete their degree requirements than was anticipated. In most cases, the extra time ranged from three to six hours and was usually undertaken in summer school. The reasons for the extra time were varied. There were some cases of poor advising at GVC; for others, it was a desire to complete a second major. In still other situations, albeit only a few, there were some problems in transferring courses which had escaped the attention of the co-ordinator. On the whole, however, the students themselves accepted the responsibility of taking an extra semester to work toward their degrees.

Fifth. Five graduates in the class of 1972 have been awarded grants for tuition and books in an M.A. degree program at Drake

University in Des Moines. The five have also received stipends of $105 per week under the Drake-Des Moines Public School Teacher Corps program.

The remainder of this chapter was designed to summarize and indicate the implications of the responses to each of the questions on the individual questionnaires (see Appendix B). Moreover, it was deemed advisable to summarize each of the four sections of the questionnaires immediately following the group of questions which constituted that division.

TABLE 4.1: JUNIOR CLASS CHARACTERISTICS, 1970-1972

GVC DATA				SEX		GVC DEGREE					TRANSFER INSTITUTION				
CLASS	N	GPA $\bar{X}$	ACT $\bar{X}$	M	F	Dip.	AA	ALA	No Deg.	3-Yr Cert.	Drake	Simp.	ISU	UofI	Other
1970	4	3.192	22.50	3	1	1	2	0	1	4	3	0	0	1	0
1971	19	3.2189	22.50	10	9	11	4	3	1	16	16	1	1	0	0
1972	25	3.2204	22.375	11	14	6	13	1	5	18	17	4	0	1	4
TOTAL	48	3.2175	22.434*	24	24	18	19	4	7	38	36	5	1	2	4

*based on an N of 46

TABLE 4.2: TRANSFER DATA, 1970 and 1971

CLASS	N	Transfer GPA $\bar{X}$	Net Change	Number of Students Up	Number of Students Down	Average Time Com. Degree
1970	4	2.965	-0.225	1	3	1.5 sem.
1971	17*	3.169	-0.0499	9	8	2.3 sem.
TOTAL	23			10	11	

*2 students did not continue as full-time students

SERVICES OF FACULTY ADVISORS AT GVC

Table 4.3: Were you adequately advised by the faculty at GVC regarding transfer of courses to the four-year college that you attended?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	4	27	1	6	10	67	15
Female	4	21	3	16	12	63	19
Total	8	24	4	12	22	64	34
Grad.	4	17	2	8	18	75	24
Part.	4	40	2	20	4	40	10
M.G.	1	9	1	9	9	82	11
F.G.	3	23	1	8	9	69	13
M.P.	3	75	0	0	1	25	4
F.P.	1	17	2	33	3	50	6

Summary. Only 24 percent of the students disagreed, and 64 percent agreed that they were adequately advised by faculty personnel at GVC regarding transfer of courses to the four-year institution they subsequently attended. However, table 4.3 indicated there was a perceptible area of disagreement between participants and graduates--particularly from male participants who had a level of disagreement of 75 percent.

Implications. Of the three male participants who disagreed with the question, one student has finally completed degree requirements, taking longer to do so than the expected two semesters. On the whole, however, the students rated the faculty personnel rather high for transfer advising. Reasons for disagreement were not indicated by the data. However, interviews with some of the students seemed to indicate that both student and advisor must share equally in the responsibility for such errors. Students, generally, were completely unaware of the requirements for their major at the transfer institutions. Faculty personnel, on the other hand, were not always advised by the students

when courses were dropped or added. Thus, most faculty members have not had complete knowledge of their advisee's progress while attending GVC, nor have they had substantial knowledge of the student's goals beyond GVC.

One possible solution to this problem would have been to give to each advisor a personal file folder for each advisee, containing pertinent test and transcript data. At the conclusion of each semester, a copy of the student's schedule and his grade report could be entered in the file. Beyond such mechanical devices, predicated upon adequate advisee assignment in the first place, the fact would remain that the most important element would be that both the student and the faculty member must be thoroughly informed of the particular current requirements of each transfer institution.

Table 4.4: At GVC, were you ever advised by faculty advisors to take courses which were unnecessary for your major at the four-year college to which you transferred?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	7	46	4	27	4	27	15
Female	12	63	1	5	6	32	19
Total	19	56	5	15	10	29	34
Grad.	13	54	4	17	7	29	24
Part.	6	60	1	10	3	30	10
M.G.	4	36	3	28	4	36	11
E.G.	9	69	1	8	3	23	13
M.P.	3	75	1	25	0	0	4
F.P.	3	50	0	0	3	50	6

Summary. Only 29 percent of all the students in the survey indicated agreement with the question, and 56 percent disagreed. Moreover, similar percentages were found to exist within each of the various

categories. Only among female participants did the question obtain a 50 percent level of agreement.

Implications. Generally speaking, the students rated the faculty members high in their advising regarding courses necessary for the student's major at the transfer institution. The high level of successful articulation for GVC during the past twenty years has meant that faculty and administration have taken tremendous steps in aligning the college's curriculum with the cooperating institutions. Moreover, in cases where "unnecessary" courses were advised, it was often part of the more general GVC degree requirements and transferred as a general elective for the student.

Table 4.5: Would you say that your GVC advisor was knowledgeable about your major?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	1	6	2	12	12	82	15
Female	6	32	2	10	11	58	19
Total	7	21	4	11	23	68	34
Grad.	6	24	2	8	16	68	24
Part.	1	10	2	20	7	70	10
M.G.	0	0	1	9	10	91	11
F.G.	6	46	1	8	6	46	13
M.P.	1	25	1	25	2	50	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. Again, former students rated the faculty high with 68 percent indicating that their GVC advisor was knowledgeable about their majors as opposed to only 21 percent who disagreed. The female graduates were the only group which indicated their displeasure with their advisors by splitting their responses evenly between agreement and disagreement.

Implications. The responses to this question correlate rather closely with the previous statement in which 56 percent of the former students agreed they had been adequately advised while they attended GVC. The high level of agreement on this question could possibly have been explained by the fact that GVC instructors have been employed in their primary teaching fields which carries the correlated implication that faculty advisors may have had a professional orientation by which they have tried to keep themselves abreast of changing requirements in their respective disciplines. Moreover, many of the faculty advisors involved with the Three-Year Program have tried to stay in direct contact with the cooperating departments of the other institutions to insure the acceptance of "their" students.

Table 4.6: Was the only time you ever consulted with your faculty advisor at GVC during registration to obtain a signature for the forms?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	11	73	0	0	4	27	15
Female	10	53	1	5	8	42	19
Total	21	62	1	3	12	35	34
Grad.	17	71	0	0	7	29	24
Part.	4	40	1	10	5	50	10
M.G.	10	91	0	0	1	9	11
F.G.	7	54	0	0	6	46	13
M.P.	1	25	0	0	3	75	4
F.P.	3	50	1	17	2	33	6

Summary. Only 35 percent of the former students agreed while 62 percent disagreed that the only time they consulted their faculty advisor at GVC was to obtain his signature on forms for registration. However, the largest deviation in responses to be noted occurred be-

tween the sexes; 73 percent of the males disagreed with the question as opposed to only 53 percent of the females.

Implications. The most interesting thing suggested by Table 4.6 was that a correlation might exist between the students who graduated and saw their advisors often as opposed to students who saw advisors only rarely and who ended up as only participants in the program. The high "disagree" percentage among graduates as opposed to the lower percentage of participants seemed to indicate that such consultations merited further attention by the college.

Furthermore, there was nothing in the data to explain the apparent harsh attitude of the males. It may have been possible that female respondents were being less critical towards the program and the college than were the males, but such an explanation could only have been conjecture.

One resolution to the problem of frequency of faculty-student contact would have been to put into the program of the college a semi-mandatory program of advising so that students and faculty could have gained a better knowledge of one another and established a more harmonious relationship.

Table 4.7: Would you say that your faculty advisor was well-informed regarding the necessary courses needed for your major at the four-year institution?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	14	5	33	8	53	15
Female	9	47	4	21	6	32	19
Total	11	32	9	27	14	41	34

Table 4.7 (continued)

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Grad.	8	34	6	24	10	42	24
Part.	3	30	3	30	4	40	10
M.G.	1	9	3	28	7	63	11
F.G.	7	54	3	23	3	23	13
M.P.	1	25	2	50	1	25	4
F.P.	2	33	1	17	3	50	6

Summary. While only 32 percent of the students disagreed with the question, and 41 percent agreed with it, there was a significant number who were simply uncertain -- 27 percent of the respondents. It was also significant to note that 47 percent of the females as opposed to only 14 percent of the males seemed to disagree regarding the knowledge of faculty advisors at GVC.

Implications. Whereas the previous item demonstrated a split between graduates and participants with only a small schism between male respondents, this question indicated a massive split between male and female students. Moreover, it was apparent from the individual responses that there was a common area of concern involved for both males and females, although the individuals did not necessarily have the same advisors. The female and male respondents who disagreed with the question were predominantly education majors. However, only part of the responsibility could be laid at the doorstep of any individual advisor when one considered the fact that the requirements for education majors have been in a state of flux at each of the cooperating institutions. Nevertheless, the implications were certainly present that some areas of advising were in need of substantial improvement.

Table 4.8: Would you say that your faculty advisor at GVC was more helpful than the one you had at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	4	26	5	34	6	40	15
Female	9	47	7	37	3	16	19
Total	13	38	12	35	9	27	34
Grad.	6	24	10	42	8	34	24
Part.	7	70	2	20	1	10	10
M.G.	1	9	4	36	6	55	11
F.G.	5	38	6	46	2	16	13
M.P.	3	75	1	25	0	0	4
F.P.	4	66	1	17	1	17	6

Summary. Once again, students seemed simply uncertain about the helpfulness of their faculty advisors at GVC. While 38 percent of the respondents disagreed outright and only 27 percent agreed, there remained 35 percent of the former students who could (or would) not make such a judgment. Moreover, the greater criticism seemed to rest with females who had 47 percent disagreement and participants who had 70 percent disagreement. In sum, it could only be said that nearly one-third of the respondents agreed the faculty advisor at GVC was more helpful than at the four-year college.

Implications. The obvious conclusion drawn from this question was that one-third of the former honors students were more satisfied withthe advising received at the four-year institution than at GVC. Moreover, as far as the female responses were concerned, there was some continuity with the previous question regarding the knowledgeability of GVC faculty advisors. However, there appears to have been a greater negative response level to this question on the part of participants than had been expected. There was nothing in the data to indicate any reason for this type of response level among the participants.

Summary of faculty advising at GVC. On the whole, the data indicated that the GVC advising program with regard to its honor students was

above average. The high degree of successful articulation between institutions was indicative of the fact that advisors were knowledgeable about institutional requirements beyond GVC. However, there has been demonstrated the problem of lack of student perception with regard to the knowledgeability of individual advisors.

Generally speaking, it has been noted that females (with the exception of Table 4.6) tended to demonstrate greater disagreement than males. Moreover, it has been shown in several areas that participants have disagreed more than graduates. Whether students became participants because of the type of advising they had could not be shown by the data collected for this study. In all probability, this was not the case. However, GVC has succeeded in alienating a small number of its students as demonstrated by several of the responses. In the following chapter some positive suggestions will be offered which will, perhaps, correct this situation in the future, assuming it is deemed advisable to continue this type of program.

INSTRUCTION AT GVC

Table 4.9: Did your background at GVC give you a good background for completing your major?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	12	3	20	10	68	15
Female	0	0	0	0	19	100	19
Total	2	6	3	9	29	85	34
Grad.	2	8	2	8	20	84	24
Part.	0	0	1	1	9	90	10
M.G.	2	18.5	2	18.5	7	63	11
F.G.	0	0	0	0	13	100	13
M.P.	0	0	1	25	3	75	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only 6 percent of the respondents disagreed while 85 percent agreed that their education at GVC gave them a good background for completing their major. However, 12 percent of the males disagreed with the question while none of the female respondents disagreed. On the other hand, 68 percent of the males and 100 percent of the females agreed with the question.

Implications. The results indicated that as far as the honor students were concerned, GVC offered a sufficient background for the completion of majors at other institutions. In fact, private conversations with a number of the respondents indicated that in certain disciplines, the background offered by GVC was, in fact, deemed superior to that offered by the four-year institution.

Table 4.10: Did you pursue the same major at the four-year college:

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	20	0	0	12	80	15
Female	0	0	0	0	19	100	19
Total	3	9	0	0	31	91	34
Grad.	3	12	0	0	21	88	24
Part.	0	0	0	0	10	100	34
M.G.	3	28	0	0	8	72	11
F.G.	0	0	0	0	13	100	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only three students, which constituted 9 percent of the sample, indicated they had changed their majors after transferring to the four-year institution. Moreover, those three students were males who had graduated with full participation in the Honors Program.

Implications. The implications were that the vast majority of the

Honor Students had self-defined goals, which were established while attending GVC, resulting in large measure from a good instructional and guidance program there. Moreover, the results indicated these self-defined goals were exceptionally strong among the female students.

Furthermore, by the third year at GVC, a student has begun to develop a major field of study. Great care has been exercised by most of the academic departments at GVC to ensure that their courses and requirements are compatible with those of the cooperating institutions. Thus, responses of the degree which were achieved with this question indicated that the Honors Program at GVC has been highly successful in fulfilling its function of integrating knowledge during the third year, thereby allowing the student to develop an even stronger major during the fourth or transfer year.

Table 4.11: Would you say that the Three-Year Program does an excellent job of preparing students for transfer to the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	1	6	9	61	5	33	15
Female	1	5	5	41	13	54	19
Total	2	6	14	41	18	53	34
Grad.	2	8	11	46	11	46	24
Part.	0	0	3	30	7	70	10
M.G.	1	9	6	55	4	36	11
F.G.	1	8	5	38	7	54	13
M.P.	0	0	3	75	1	25	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only 6 percent of the students disagreed and 53 percent agreed that the Three-Year Program did an excellent job of preparing students for transfer to the four-year college. Moreover, 8 percent

of the graduates disagreed with the question while none of the participants disagreed. On the other hand, 70 percent of the participants agreed as compared with only 46 percent of the graduates.

Implications. While the results indicated a positive response toward the Honors Program at GVC for preparing students for transfer, it was interesting to note the high level of uncertainty among all groups of respondents. In large measure, this was a result of the fact that many of the students had not really been away long enough to make a full and intelligent assessment. Moreover, a number of students indicated there was a problem with this question in that it was difficult for them to separate the instructional services of the college itself from that of the Three-Year Program. The general feeling, then, was that the Honor's Program has no special virtues apart from the general college program in preparing transfer students. In summary, it was the college and not the Three-Year Program which students perceived as doing an excellent job of preparing students for transfer.

Table 4.12: Did you find the courses at the four-year institution more time consuming?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	7	46	3	21	5	33	15
Female	9	47	4	21	6	32	19
Total	16	48	7	20	11	32	34
Grad.	12	50	6	25	6	25	24
Part.	4	40	1	10	5	50	10
M.G.	6	55	3	28	2	17	11
F.G.	6	46	3	23	4	31	13
M.P.	1	25	0	0	3	75	4
F.P.	3	50	1	17	2	33	6

Summary. The data indicated that 48 percent of the students dis-

agreed, and 32 percent agreed the courses at the four-year institution were more time consuming. While the percentages demonstrated no major split between males and females, there was some disagreement between graduates and participants. While 50 percent of the graduates disagreed with the question, 50 percent of the participants agreed that the courses at the four-year college were indeed more time consuming than equivalent courses at GVC.

Implications. Since many of the students indicated varying degrees of uncertainty with regard to this question, it was apparent that the courses at GVC must have been at least as time consuming as the courses at the four-year institution. Strangely enough, there was no indication that time consuming courses were related to any particular institution. In most cases, where students claimed time consuming courses at the transfer institution, it was related to the individual and his or her own abilities rather than to the institution itself. This also helped to explain why a greater percentage of participants, as opposed to graduates, agreed with the question. The better students found it necessary to spend a great amount of time on their courses while attending GVC, thus the transition to the four-year college was a relatively simple matter for most of them. Participants, on the other hand, had, in all likelihood, developed bad study habits during their first two or three years and were then forced into the sudden realization that more time would be necessary for their courses during the fourth year just to maintain their status quo in terms of grade point average.

Table 4.13: Would you agree that the quality of grading at GVC is tougher than at the four-year level?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	20	6	40	6	40	15
Female	6	32	7	36	6	32	19
Total	9	27	13	38	12	35	34
Grad.	6	24	8	34	10	42	24
Part.	3	30	5	50	2	20	10
M.G.	3	28	3	28	5	44	11
F.G.	3	23	5	38.5	5	38.5	13
M.P.	0	0	3	75	1	25	4
F.P.	3	50	2	33	1	17	6

Summary. Only 27 percent of the former students disagreed and 35 percent agreed that grading at GVC is more stringent than at the four-year institution. While there was some disparity between the various classes of subjects in this study, the overriding conclusion was that 38 percent of the students were simply undecided. Moreover, the percentage of students who reported an uncertain response were generally participants in the program who had not graduated.

Implications. Although a clear majority of students did not report that the grading at GVC was more demanding than at the four-year institution, at the same time, there was no implication that those institutions had grading standards significantly harsher than that of GVC. Many of the respondents had simply not attended the transfer institution long enough to fully assess the grading norms of the respective colleges. Furthermore, it was expected that students who had encountered some difficulties at GVC, either academically or socially, would encounter greater problems upon their transfer. Thus, the higher rating from these students corresponded to preconceived notions of

student achievement.

Table 4.14: Would you agree that the quality of instruction at GVC is higher than at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	1	6	9	61	5	33	15
Female	5	27	12	63	2	10	19
Total	6	18	21	62	7	20	34
Grad.	4	17	14	59	6	24	24
Part.	2	20	8	80	0	0	10
M.G.	1	9	5	45.5	5	45.5	11
F.G.	3	23	8	61	2	16	13
M.P.	0	0	4	100	0	0	4
F.P.	2	35	4	65	0	0	6

Summary. Only 18 percent of the students disagreed and 20 percent agreed that the quality of instruction at GVC was higher than that of the four-year college. Percentagewise, more females (27) than males (6) disagreed with the question; however, there was a rather consistent undecided response which resulted in a 62 percent figure for this category among all students polled.

Implications. While the majority of former students did not rate the quality of instruction at GVC higher than at the four-year institution, there was, nevertheless, a large percentage of undecided responses. Moreover, the equivocal nature of those responses seemed to indicate that while the quality of instruction at GVC may not have been higher, neither was it lower than at the four-year institutions. Again, those responses could not have been compared with standard articulation studies because of the biased nature of the sample which was involved. Most of the student responses were from individuals

who had experienced only two semesters at the transfer institution, which was not sufficient time to permit any of them from drawing any definitive conclusions.

Table 4.15: Would you say that you found more personal interest from the instructors at GVC than at the four-year institution?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	0	0	4	27	11	73	15
Female	3	16	2	20	14	64	19
Total	3	9	6	18	25	73	34
Grad.	2	8	4	17	18	75	24
Part.	1	10	2	20	7	70	10
M.G.	0	0	2	18	9	82	11
F.G.	2	15.5	2	15.5	9	69	13
M.P.	0	0	2	50	2	50	4
F.P.	1	17	0	0	5	83	6

Summary. Only 9 percent of the students disagreed while 73 percent agreed that there was more personal interest from the instructors at GVC than at the four-year institution. Moreover, there was no significant deviation from this percentage among any of the classes, except among male participants who were divided with 50 percent being undecided and 50 percent agreed.

Implications. Former honor students at GVC rated instructors as having a personal interest in the students, which has traditionally lent itself to a desirable philosophy of education, especially essential at the junior college level. Moreover, the personal interest aspect of education at GVC has long been considered one of the unique factors in the existence of the college. Such concern reflected a major portion of its Christian commitment, which has been

a significant element in the institution as it sought to perpetuate its ties with the church. Furthermore, the college's concern with the education and development of the total individual has required the individual commitment of every instructor to develop a personal interest in and association with each student, insofar as has been possible.

Table 4.16: Would you say there is a friendlier atmosphere at GVC than at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	0	0	2	12	13	88	15
Female	3	16	3	16	13	63	19
Total	3	9	5	15	26	76	34
Grad.	3	12	5	20	16	68	24
Part.	0	0	0	0	10	100	10
M.G.	0	0	2	18	9	82	11
F.G.	3	23	3	23	7	54	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only 9 percent of all respondents disagreed, while 76 percent agreed that there was a friendlier atmosphere at GVC than at the four-year college. Moreover, the percentages were even greater among participants (100) than among graduates of the program (68), with the greatest erosion of support having come from female graduates who had a 23 percent level of disagreement.

Implication. The positive response toward the friendlier atmosphere of GVC may have been an indication that the faculty has had personal interest in the students and has traditionally aided students in adjusting to the various patterns of college life. Under such an

atmosphere, the student has felt free and relatively at ease in consulting with the instructors and asking for help and advice. While this has traditionally been considered an important element for junior college students, especially those who have had ill-defined goals for themselves, it has been another of the distinguishing characteristics of GVC. Moreover, it might be anticipated that if this question had been asked of non-participants in the Honors Program, a similar response level would have been obtained. While many private colleges and universities have boasted of the friendlier atmosphere, few have been able to achieve response rates of this magnitude.

Furthermore, if the foregoing could be considered to be valid, it then would tend to re-enforce the interpretation of Table 4.15, regarding the amount of personal interest demonstrated in students by the instructors.

Table 4.17: Do you feel that your instructors at GVC were well qualified and compared favorably to the instructors at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	1	6	2	12	12	82	15
Female	0	0	2	10	17	90	19
Total	1	3	4	12	29	85	34
Grad.	1	4	2	8	21	88	24
Part.	0	0	2	20	8	80	10
M.G.	1	9	1	9	9	82	11
F.G.	0	0	1	8	12	92	13
M.P.	0	0	1	25	3	75	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. Only 3 percent of the students disagreed, and 85 percent agreed that their instructors at GVC were well-qualified and compared favorably with instructors at the transfer institutions. Moreover, there was no significant deviation from this percentage among any of the groups analyzed in the table.

Implications. The qualifications of the instructors rated inordinately high with the greater percentage of respondents. While the instrument permitted students to compare GVC instructors favorably with instructors at the four-year institutions, many students indicated that they would have even rated GVC instructors higher had the questionnaire permitted such discrimination. Of major importance here was the discrepancy between responses received to this question and the one presented in Table 4.14 regarding the quality of instruction at GVC. It may be recalled that in that table the students seemed uncertain about the quality of education offered at GVC. The general implications then would have been that the instructors as instructors have received favorable ratings, and it had to be assumed that the uncertainty rested more with the courses than with the manner of presentation. Ultimately, then, the faculty of GVC seemed to have merited an unusual amount of praise from its former honor students while a certain question remained concerning the quality of individual courses.

Table 4.18: Did you find that your instructors at GVC were always willing and available for help?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	0	0	1	6	14	94	15
Female	0	0	2	10	17	90	19
Total	0	0	3	9	31	91	34
Grad.	0	0	0	0	24	100	24
Part.	0	0	3	30	7	70	10
M.G.	0	0	0	0	11	100	11
F.G.	0	0	0	0	13	100	13
M.P.	0	0	1	15	3	75	4
F.P.	0	0	2	33	4	67	6

Summary. None of the respondents disagreed while 91 percent agreed that instructors at GVC were always willing and available for help. However, the incidence of uncertainty or undecidedness increased among the participants (30 percent) and not with the graduates.

Implications. The instructors at GVC were interested in the students' progress and achievements. They were willing to help and were available for assisting students. The extremely high positive response of students to this question indicated that students were not only satisfied but pleased with the calibre of instruction offered by GVC.

Summary of Instruction. Generally speaking, the instructional aspects of GVC were highly rated by its former Honor Students. While the curricular aspects were not treated at length in this section, there was some indication that the respondents were more favorably inclined toward the instructors and the various methods of instruction rather than toward specific courses.

Furthermore, there appears to have been an element of the "sour grapes" phenomenon among participants. These students, unaware or unwilling to face their own shortcomings, apparently have attempted to displace their hostilities on the whole program. On the other hand, graduates of the program have been remarkably favorable in their responses to both faculty advising as well as instruction.

Finally, it would appear that GVC has been rather successful among its Honor Students in achieving its institutional purposes (see p. 18), particularly in the realm of demonstrating educational and Christian concern for the advancement of individual students as human beings. While it has often appeared trite, to say the least, to suggest that private, church-related institutions have attempted to fulfill their Christian commitments to the individual, it does appear to have been the case with GVC. Moreover, it would appear that even though GVC has entered a highly competitive educational marketplace, one of its strongest assets has remained its high quality of instruction and Christian concern for the individual student.

CURRICULUM AT GVC

Table 4.19: Were the courses offered at GVC sufficient to meet the general requirements at the college to which you transferred?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	20	3	20	9	60	15
Female	0	0	1	5	18	95	19
Total	3	9	4	12	27	79	34
Grad.	2	8	2	8	20	84	24
Part.	1	10	2	20	7	70	10
M.G.	2	18.5	2	18.5	7	63	11
F.G.	0	0	0	0	13	100	13
M.P.	1	25	1	25	2	50	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. Only 9 percent of the students disagreed, and 79 percent agreed that the courses offered at GVC were sufficient to meet the general requirements of the college to which they transferred. Again there was some erosion of positive responses from males who disagreed at a level of 20 percent while the female respondents agreed at the 95 percent level.

Implications. For curriculum services, students gave a very high rating to the courses offered at GVC as being sufficient to meet the four-year colleges' general requirements. However, it must be pointed out that given the unique nature of GVC and of its Honors Program, this response was anticipated. Therefore, the further implication of this question was that while GVC has been offering courses which have been sufficient for the needs of most students, there have apparently been areas in which course offerings could have been increased and/or improved since the theoretical response to this question should have

been at the 100 percent level of agreement as far as the college has been concerned.

Table 4.19, however, provided only a quantitative summary of course offerings without being concerned with the content of the courses. That dimension, therefore, received attention next.

Table 4.20: Was the content of the courses offered at GVC sufficient to give you a good basic background for the courses which you took at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	12	1	6	12	82	15
Female	1	5	1	5	17	90	19
Total	3	6	2	9	29	85	34
Grad.	2	8	1	4	21	88	24
Part.	1	10	1	10	8	80	10
M.G.	2	18	0	0	9	82	11
F.G.	0	0	1	8	12	92	13
M.P.	0	0	1	25	3	75	4
F.P.	1	17	0	0	5	83	6

Summary. Only 6 percent of the former students disagreed and 85 percent agreed with the question that the content of the courses offered at GVC gave the students a very good basic background for courses they pursued at their transfer institutions. The uncertain group was once again dominated by the participants, but only at a 10 percent level.

Implications. The previous question indicated that 79 percent of the Honor students thought that the courses offered by GVC were sufficient to meet the general requirements of their transfer institutions. However, this question indicated a greater positive feeling

toward the actual content of the courses offered by GVC. Thus, the implication was that there has existed a serious deficiency in the breadth of course offerings by GVC. Whereas many institutions have faced severe difficulties in the qualitative aspects of their curricula, GVC has apparently been plagued with problems of a quantitative sort. Moreover, it was once again apparent that the "sour grapes" phenomenon may have accounted for the types of responses to this question. Even if that were true, however, the students have at least remained uncertain rather than negative in their responses and assessments of course content at GVC.

Table 4.21: Would you say that you had no difficulty in transferring any of your courses to the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	6	40	0	0	9	60	15
Female	4	21	1	15	14	64	19
Total	10	29	1	3	23	68	34
Grad.	7	29	1	4	16	67	24
Part.	3	30	0	0	7	70	10
M.G.	5	45	0	0	6	55	11
F.G.	2	16	1	8	10	76	13
M.P.	1	25	0	0	3	75	4
F.P.	2	33	0	0	4	67	6

Summary. While only 29 percent of the students disagreed and 68 percent agreed that there was no difficulty transferring their courses to their transfer institutions, there was a greater problem for the graduates than for the participants. Participants agreed with the question at a level of 70 percent as opposed to 67 percent for graduates.

Implications. While the data indicated that the majority of students encountered no difficulty in transferring their courses, the percentages were not as high as might have been expected given the high level of general articulation between the Honor students and the cooperating institutions. Moreover, since the Honors program has been predicated upon the high degree of transferability of courses, it was necessary to elicit individual responses in order to clarify these figures.

Generally speaking, the problems encountered were either with courses required by GVC which transferred solely as electives (e.g. courses in religion) or they were related to courses in education. In the latter case, most of the cooperating institutions with programs in education have been jealous of others offering such courses. Each department or College of Education has attempted to pre-empt other efforts of preparing people in that discipline. Thus, while the general transferability of courses has been rather respectable, there have been areas where massive advising and planning have been essential to assist the student in avoiding certain problems.

Table 4.22: Did you take some courses at GVC which were not required at the four-year college?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	20	1	6	11	74	15
Female	5	36	0	0	14	64	19
Total	8	24	1	3	24	73	34
Grad.	4	17	1	9	19	79	24
Part.	4	40	0	0	6	60	10
M.G.	2	18	1	9	8	73	11
F.G.	2	16	0	0	11	84	13
M.P.	1	25	0	0	3	75	4
F.P.	3	50	0	0	3	50	6

Summary. Only 24 percent of the students disagreed, and 73 percent agreed that they took some courses at GVC which were not required at the four-year college. Both males and graduates had higher percentages of agreement, 74 percent and 79 percent respectively, than did the females or the participants.

Implications. The fact that 49 percent more of the students agreed that they took some courses at GVC that were not required at the four-year college implied that they took elective hours to complete their schedules for graduation. It did not necessarily suggest that they lost credit for the courses at the transfer institutions, inasmuch as only 29 percent responded to the previous question that they had had difficulty in transferring courses. Moreover, the high percentage of students taking extra courses indicated that GVC has done more than just provide the necessary background for the development of majors; it has apparently been able to offer students some selection of courses which means that a small element of breadth has

been present. Furthermore, these figures correspond to a time when GVC instituted a credit-no credit option for courses not in the student's major, which may have been a contributing factor in permitting students to explore new areas of academic interest.

Table 4.23: Did GVC do an excellent job of preparing you for your major?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	12	6	40	7	48	15
Female	1	5	4	21	14	74	19
Total	3	9	10	29	21	62	34
Grad.	3	12	4	17	17	71	24
Part.	0	0	6	60	4	40	10
M.G.	2	17	3	28	6	55	11
F.G.	1	8	1	18	11	84	13
M.P.	0	0	3	75	1	25	4
F.P.	0	0	3	50	3	50	6

Summary. Only 9 percent of the students disagreed and 62 percent agreed that GVC did an excellent job of preparing them for their major. Moreover, the data indicated disparate elements among all classes of respondents. For example, males disagreed at a level of 12 percent, and females disagreed at 5 percent. Similarly, the participants did not disagree at all, while 12 percent of the graduates disagreed.

Implications. Generally speaking, the respondents rated GVC relatively high in preparing them for their major, with 53 percent more of the students agreeing than disagreeing. However, the word "excellent" may have been too strong a choice of words which could have resulted in the rather high percentages of students who were

simply undecided. Perhaps, too, one year in the major beyond GVC was an inadequate exposure to the major for the majority of these students.

Nevertheless, the college has been able to re-assure itself of its value as a result of the low number of students who disagreed with the question. Apparently, the strongest implication was that GVC has not done a poor job of preparing students for their majors.

Table 4.24: Do you think GVC has a well-planned course sequence?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	20	6	40	6	40	15
Female	0	0	6	32	13	68	19
Total	3	9	12	35	19	56	34
Grad.	1	4	9	37	14	59	24
Part.	2	20	3	30	5	50	10
M.G.	1	9	5	45.5	5	45.5	11
F.G.	0	0	4	31	9	69	13
M.P.	2	50	1	25	1	25	4
F.P.	0	0	2	33	4	67	6

Summary. Only 9 percent of the students disagreed and 56 percent agreed that there was a well-planned course sequence at GVC. Again, there appears to have been a sharp difference between males who agreed (40 percent) and females (68 percent); however, the only really significant disagreement came from male participants (50 percent).

Implications. Generally speaking, the respondents rated very high the curriculum planning of GVC; however, while the degree of agreement was not perhaps as great as the institution might have wished, it was significant that there was such a low level of disagreement. Again, part of the undecided responses may have been a

result of the short exposure to other experiences at the transfer institution. One alternative explanation for this pattern may have been in the individual nature of those reporting the negative responses resulting in still another manifestation of the "sour grapes" phenomenon.

Finally, it was necessary to be aware of the fact that during this time period, curricula and course sequences were undergoing many modifications by most institutions of higher learning, and the transfer institutions were no exception. Thus, students may have tried to make comparisons which were unwarranted.

Table 4.25: Do you agree that you had no problem, either socially or academically, at the four-year college to which you transferred?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	5	33	4	27	6	40	15
Female	1	5	2	10	16	85	19
Total	6	18	6	18	22	64	34
Grad.	6	24	4	17	14	59	24
Part.	0	0	2	20	8	80	10
M.G.	5	44	3	28	3	28	11
F.G.	1	8	1	8	11	84	13
M.P.	0	0	1	25	3	75	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. Only 18 percent of the students disagreed, and 64 percent agreed that they had no problems, either socially or academically at the four-year college to which they transferred. However, there was a sharp disparity between male and female responses. Males disagreed at a level of 33 percent while females showed only 5 percent

disagreement. Alternatively, males were 40 percent agreed as opposed to females who were 85 percent agreed.

Implications. While GVC has done more than an adequate job of providing services to its students, again there was apparently more that needed to be done. However, the problem has been that of assessing the general nature of the problem. Apparently, as the previous series of questions has indicated, the major problem has not been the course or instruction offered by GVC. The implication was that the respondents must have been concerned with social problems, which in turn may be a result of financial problems. The Knoell and Medsker study of 1965 indicated that the economic plight of junior college students has been a consistent thread in studying junior colleges (p. 69). Furthermore, this would have accounted for the greater disagreement among males than among females since the American college male has not been liberated from his role as the provider of collegiate social life.

Summary of Curriculum. While curriculum services have generally received high ratings by former Honor students of GVC, there has been a general feeling that more could have been done. First, the college has been providing sufficient courses to assure the transfer of its Honor students, but it has done nothing about going beyond what has been simply adequate. Apparently, students desired to see more courses added to the curriculum which would have provided more alternatives in terms of majors and minors.

Second, as was apparent from Table 4.21, the college has not done all that it could in easing the transferability of courses among cooperating institutions. The type of program which GVC has offered to its Honor students required a degree of cooperation with other institutions that has been unprecedented among junior and senior colleges. To be successful, such close cooperation must be considered absolutely essential.

Third, Table 4.23 indicated that some of the departments at GVC have not done quite as much as they should have in preparing their majors for transfer to other institutions. Student conversations have indicated that their primary concern has been the lack of professional orientation which normally should have begun developing by the junior year. A resolution of this situation would have to take place between individual departments and their majors.

Fourth, apparently GVC has not kept abreast of changing course sequences as the transfer institutions have adopted them. In this kind of situation, the only saving factor at GVC has been its immense degree of flexibility. However, perhaps the curriculum could become even more flexible by establishing department requirements rather than college requirements for transfer work.

In summation, GVC has been able to provide an adequate curriculum; however, the institution must make the future decision as to whether it wants to be a good curriculum.

THREE-YEAR PROGRAM

Table 4.26: Would you say that you benefited from participating in the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	12	2	12	11	76	15
Female	0	0	1	5	18	95	19
Total	2	6	3	9	29	85	34
Grad.	2	8	3	12	19	80	24
Part.	0	0	0	0	10	100	10
M.G.	2	17	2	17	7	63	11
F.G.	0	0	1	8	12	92	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only 6 percent of the students disagreed, and 85 percent agreed that they had benefited from participation in the Three-Year Program. Interestingly enough, the only group that disagreed were male graduates (17 percent), while the participants were in 100 percent agreement.

Implications. The first and most obvious conclusion to be drawn from this table was that the "sour grapes" phenomenon discussed in the section on curriculum apparently did not apply to the Three-Year Program itself, just to the curriculum of the college. Moreover, there was also the implication that male students have been more demanding of the college and the program than have female students, who have been responding rather favorably to most of the questions.

Second, it was impossible to ascertain from this question in what way individuals may have benefited. Private interviews indicated that benefits were usually associated with monetary considerations first and academics second.

Table 4.27: Would you agree that the weekly seminars were everything you had anticipated?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	8	53	3	20	4	27	15
Female	9	47	7	37	3	16	19
Total	17	50	10	29	7	21	34
Grad.	11	47	7	29	6	24	24
Part.	6	60	3	30	1	10	10
M.G.	6	55	2	18	3	27	11
F.G.	5	38.5	5	38.5	3	23	13
M.P.	2	50	1	25	1	25	4
F.P.	4	67	2	33	0	0	6

Summary. Only 21 percent of all the respondents agreed, while 50 percent disagreed that the weekly seminars were everything they had anticipated. While graduates agreed 14 percent more than participants, less than one-quarter of them agreed to the question.

Implications. Apparently, the seminar aspect of the Three-Year Program has been oversold to the students, primarily through the creation of high expectations which have not been met. Private interviews suggested that the primary areas of contention involved the topics of the seminar which were not integrated as the students had been led to expect through the literature which had been presented to them about the program. Furthermore, some topics apparently had little relevance for the students in their junior year (e.g. "How to Use the Library" -- other topics may be found in Appendix C).

Moreover, a number of students indicated concern about the manner in which grades were assigned for seminar participation. Grades were based upon the subjective evaluation of the coordinator and based

upon attendance and individual contribution and did not necessarily reflect any advancement made by the student within the seminar experience itself.

Table 4.28: Did you get very much out of the seminars?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	4	27	6	40	5	33	15
Female	5	26	4	21	10	53	19
Total	9	27	10	29	15	44	34
Grad.	7	29	5	21	12	50	24
Part.	2	20	5	50	3	30	10
M.G.	3	27	4	36.5	4	36.5	11
F.G.	4	31	1	8	8	61	13
M.P.	1	25	2	50	1	25	4
F.P.	1	17	3	50	2	33	6

Summary. While 27 percent of the students disagreed, 44 percent agreed that they got very much out of the seminar. Graduates apparently got more out of the seminar by 20 percent; however, even they were sharply divided between males and females. Male graduates indicated that they agreed 36.5 percent of the time while female graduates were 61 percent agreed.

Implications. Since the question was purposely left ambiguous, it was assumed that those who agreed with the question could identify something which they had gained. The unusually large number of responses in both the "disagree" and "undecided" categories indicated that students perceived the seminars to be less than valuable for them as individuals. Apparently, responses to this item paralleled the responses to the previous question concerning the weekly seminars.

In summary, it appeared that the seminars were unable to measure up to the high expectations held by most of the participating students. Interviews indicated that most students did not perceive the seminars as viable attempts to integrate knowledge; rather they were disparate mini-courses which appeared to be "irrelevant" and, at times, "infantile."

Table 4.29: Did you try to encourage fellow students to enter the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	3	30	0	0	12	80	15
Female	2	11	1	5	16	84	19
Total	5	15	1	3	28	82	34
Grad.	5	21	0	0	19	79	24
Part.	0	0	1	10	9	90	10
M.G.	3	27	0	0	8	73	11
F.G.	2	16	0	0	11	84	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. Only 15 percent of the students disagreed, while 82 percent agreed that they tried to encourage their fellow students to enter the Three-Year Program. While male graduates apparently did the least recruiting, 73 percent of them still indicated some level of encouragement.

Implications. While the previous two questions indicated some dissatisfaction with the weekly seminars, there was apparently enough general satisfaction with the overall program that a majority of the participants felt obliged to encourage other students to enter the Three-Year Program. Quite possibly this may have been explained by

the generally high level of curriculum and instruction which GVC has had. In short, the Three-Year Program may quite possibly have been viewed as a means to an end -- an opportunity to stay at GVC with all its major advantages -- instead of staying because the program had any inherent merit of its own. Furthermore, the institutional data presented in Table 1 indicated that while the general enrollment of GVC has shown some decline, the proportionate number of juniors has been increasing. Therefore, the assumption can be made that participants have been somewhat successful in their recruitment efforts for the Three-Year Program.

Table 4.30: If you had it to do all over again, would you still enter the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	13	6	40	7	47	15
Female	2	11	3	16	14	73	19
Total	4	12	9	26	21	62	34
Grad.	3	12.5	9	37.5	12	50	24
Part.	2	20	0	0	8	80	10
M.G.	2	18	6	55	3	27	11
F.G.	1	8	3	23	9	69	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	1	17	0	0	5	83	6

Summary. Only 12 percent of the students disagreed, while only 62 percent agreed that if they had the opportunity they would still enter the Three-Year Program. Apparently, 26 percent of the students could not decide what they would do. Moreover, among those who were undecided, males made up 40 percent of the total.

Implications. While there was general concensus among the students about entering the program again, it was surprising to observe the high level of undecided responses. It was impossible to ascertain from this type of question why these people were undecided; however, it might have been a result of their generally low opinion of the honor seminar which many students have indicated as being irrelevant and unimaginative.

However, it was difficult to reconcile responses to this question with the previous item in which students indicated that on a whole they would and did encourage other students to enter the program. It was somewhat surprising that they would recruit others for a program they themselves were undecided about re-entering.

Table 4.31: Was it primarily for academic reasons that you entered the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	12	80	1	7	2	13	15
Female	11	58	5	26	3	16	19
Total	23	67	6	18	5	15	35
Grad.	16	67	3	12	5	21	24
Part.	7	70	3	30	0	0	10
M.G.	9	82	0	0	2	18	11
F.G.	7	54	3	23	3	23	13
M.P.	3	75	1	25	0	0	4
F.P.	4	69	2	33	0	0	6

Summary. Only 15 percent of the students agreed, while 67 percent disagreed that it was primarily for academic reasons that they had entered the Three-Year Program. Furthermore, none of the participants indicated that it was because of any academic orientation

that they had entered the program.

Implications. It was obvious from the responses to this question that although the Three-Year Program was designed for Honor Students and has had a multitude of altruistic aims for providing an excellent background prior to embarking on a Master's Degree, the students have not been impressed with any concept of academics associated with the program. Generally speaking, student perceptions of the program have been directed along lines other than academic excellence or academic integration of knowledge. What reasons students had for entering the program were not readily available through the data obtained in this question. However, it was indeed sufficiently clear that most of the participants have not regarded the program as an Honors Program but as a Three-Year Program which does not involve a high degree of academic excellence. Furthermore, according to student responses, the program has done very little itself to project an image of being oriented towards any conception of academic excellence.

Table 4.32: Did financial considerations enter into your decision to enter the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	2	13	0	0	13	87	15
Female	0	0	0	0	19	100	19
Total	2	6	0	0	32	94	34
Grad.	2	8	0	0	22	92	24
Part.	0	0	0	0	10	100	10
M.G.	2	18	0	0	9	82	11
F.G.	0	0	0	0	13	100	13
M.P.	0	0	0	0	4	100	4
F.P.	0	0	0	0	6	100	6

Summary. Only 6 percent of the students disagreed, while 94 percent agreed that financial considerations entered into the decision to enter the Three-Year Program. Moreover, this was the only question on which everyone either agreed or disagreed.

Implications. In the previous question, it was noted that it was not primarily for academic reasons that students entered the Three-Year Program. The responses to this question clearly indicated that finances constituted a major reason for participation.

Not only were the students able to save on their tuition at the transfer institution (usually Drake University, whose tuition is now more than twice that of GVC), but participants were also given a $100 scholarship for each semester of successful participation in the program. Furthermore, most of the students perceived the situation as one of a real "bargain." They were able to get a high quality education through the faculty and curriculum of GVC without paying prestige prices for it.

Finally, since the program guarantees acceptance of GVC work at the cooperating institutions, there has not been any element of chance for the student to consider. Thus, the financial aspect of participation appeared to be of major significance in determining student participation in the program.

Table 4.33: Since the Three-Year Program is designed to permit you to finish your degree within a year of your transfer, were you able to complete your degree within one year?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	1	7	4	27	10	66	15
Female	3	16	3	16	13	68	19
Total	4	12	7	21	23	67	34
Grad.	3	12	5	21	16	67	24
Part.	1	10	2	20	7	70	10
M.G.	1	9	3	27	7	64	11
F.G.	2	17	2	17	9	66	13
M.P.	0	0	1	25	3	75	4
F.P.	1	17	1	17	4	66	6

Summary. Only 12 percent of the students disagreed, while 67 percent agreed that they were able to complete their degree requirements within one year from the date of their transfer. Moreover, while there was no significant deviation among any of the categories, it was interesting that the participants had a slightly higher level of agreement than did the graduates of the program.

Implications. The Three-Year Program has been highly successful in terms of enabling students to complete their degree requirements at the transfer institution. Those students who disagreed with this question were unable to explain why it had taken longer than was expected; however, many of the specific reasons have already been presented as it was gathered from the institutional data (e.g. pregnancy, illness, etc.). Generally speaking, the inability to have completed a degree within the year was not a fault of the program.

In most cases, the reason lay with the individual student and his or her advisor.

Parenthetically, the students who were undecided about this question were largely students who were still enrolled in degree programs at the transfer institutions and who did not have a firm indication from their new advisors as to how long it would take to complete degree requirements.

Table 4.34: Do you think that a student's grade point average should be the primary criterion for admission to the Three-Year Program?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	8	53	4	27	3	20	15
Female	8	42	8	43	3	10	19
Total	16	47	12	35	6	18	34
Grad.	13	54	7	29	4	17	24
Part.	3	30	5	50	2	20	10
M.G.	6	55	3	27	2	18	11
F.G.	7	54	4	31	2	15	13
M.P.	2	50	1	25	1	25	4
F.P.	1	17	4	66	1	17	6

Summary. Only 18 percent of the students agreed, while 47 percent disagreed that a student's grade point average should be the primary criterion for admission to the Three-Year Program. Moreover, the higher percentages which disagreed were found among males as opposed to females and graduates as opposed to participants.

Implications. Since most students have indicated that the program has lost any meaning as an Honors Program, it was expected that the data would indicate that students would have preferred to see the grade point dropped as admission criterion. Moreover, it was

demonstrated earlier that the high regard students have had for the third year has been toward the curriculum and faculty of GVC rather than the specific program under investigation. Perhaps, GVC would have been in a better overall position if it had explored the possibility of phasing out the Honors Program and instituting a Third-Year Program which would be open to most students.

Indeed, in the fall semester of 1972, the college lowered the grade point average from 3.0 to 2.8 for admission to the program. It was too early, however, to assess what impact, if any, this would have on the program.

Table 4.35: Do you think the Three-Year Program should be expanded to include more students?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	0	0	5	33	10	67	15
Female	0	0	5	26	14	74	19
Total	0	0	10	29	24	71	34
Grad.	0	0	7	29	17	71	24
Part.	0	0	3	30	7	70	10
M.G.	0	0	3	27	8	73	11
F.G.	0	0	4	31	9	69	13
M.P.	0	0	2	50	2	50	4
F.P.	0	0	1	17	5	83	6

Summary. None of the students disagreed, while 71 percent agreed that the Three-Year Program ought to be expanded to include more students. Moreover, there was no significant deviation between the various categories with regard to this question.

Implications. The previous question indicated strong disagreement by students regarding the use of the grade point average to

determine participation in the Three-Year Program. The data from this table clearly indicated that students would like to have seen the program enlarged in the number of students it would serve. Proportionately to the remainder of the student body, participation has increased. However, some of the increase has been a direct result of lowered admission standards with no indication, to date, of the net effect of this change.

Furthermore, interviews with graduates have suggested that most students would like to see the junior year become a permanent addition to the college's program without necessarily making it an Honors Program. To this end, the college and its Board of Trustees have begun to investigate the feasibility of such action during the fall semester of 1972.

Nevertheless, students have seriously raised the question of whether such expansion would serve any benefit unless the program were to be changed.

Table 4.36: Did participation in the Three-Year Program give you special status among faculty and administration at your transfer school?

	disagree		undecided		agree		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	total
Male	8	53	2	14	5	33	15
Female	12	63	3	16	4	21	19
Total	20	59	5	15	9	26	34
Grad.	15	63	2	8	7	29	24
Part.	5	50	3	30	2	20	10
M.G.	7	64	0	0	4	36	11
F.G.	8	62	2	15	3	23	13
M.P.	1	25	2	50	1	25	4
F.P.	4	67	1	16.5	1	16.5	6

Summary. Only 26 percent of the students agreed, while 59 percent disagreed that participation in the Three-Year Program gave them special status among faculty and administration at the transfer institution. As might have been expected, status was slightly higher for graduates (29 percent) as opposed to participants (20 percent).

Implications. Apparently, students who participated in the special experiment designated as an Honors Program, had no major status increase conferred upon them by the faculty and administration of the transfer institution. In most cases, moreover, where students indicated special status or preferential treatment, it was more a result of their having been students at GVC than participants in the program per se.

Such responses clearly ran counter to recent findings by Sievert (1972, p. 1), who noted that many of the nation's Honor programs have been considered elitist and tended to confer special status upon participants.

Summary of the Three-Year Program. The 11 questions in this section indicated that students who had participated in the Three-Year Honors Program at GVC were less than enthusiastic about the program itself. Chief among the benefits which were derived from participation in the program were financial savings for the individual as well as the opportunity to continue their studies at GVC for the third year. The academic content of the program was not regarded as a sufficient element in and of itself to warrant student involvement.

By and large, student responses to the questions in this section indicated that they really have not perceived their participation as involvement in a "Three-Year Program for Superior Students." Rather, the program has been viewed as a means to continue taking quality coursework at an acceptable financial cost and in a friendly and helpful atmosphere. Moreover, student assessments of the program clearly indicated that they have not been challenged or intellectually rewarded by their participation in the program.

Thus, while the program has fulfilled its objectives of starting students on their majors and providing a high degree of articulation between the junior college and the university, it has not provided the individual student with the intellectual stimulation necessary to continue studying for the Master's degree. If, however, the uniqueness of the program has been only in the area of inter-institutional cooperation, the program has been a tremendous success. Primarily, what remains to be done is for the college to reassess its role in higher education and then direct its attention toward the Three-Year Program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

This study was designed to evaluate an innovative junior college program for honor students at Grand View College. The evaluation was made by asking former participants of the program to rate the instructional, curricular, and honors program of the college, according to a common questionnaire. Thirty-four or 70.8 percent of the questionnaires sent to 48 students were returned and evaluated. Supplementary data on all 48 students was obtained from each of the cooperating institutions concerning grade point averages, time for the completion of degrees, etc. The results of the study were based on individual responses to these questionnaires and some interviews, as well as academic records at GVC and the cooperating institution.

Assuming student responses reflected their true evaluation, honor students were exceptionally well satisfied with curricular and instructional services at GVC. However, on a whole, their responses to the honors program reflected varying degrees of dissatisfaction. Furthermore, there was the implicit notion that the criticism which was offered was meant in a positive fashion. Most students seemed satisfied with the concept of the honors program; they were more

concerned about its shortcomings in practice than with its theoretical constructs.

Furthermore, the questionnaires and interviews indicated that former GVC students perceived their educational experiences at GVC had not only been beneficial to them, personally, but that they would recommend it for other students. Both the quality of faculty instruction as well as the courses offered in preparation for further college work were rated very high. The most favorable ratings were given to the quality of course work, the ability of instructors in teaching, and the general friendly atmosphere of the college. In summary, the generalizations made on the questionnaires and specific comments from individual students indicated enthusiastic support for GVC.

The honor students, however, were far less enthusiastic about the program which had been established for them. Criticisms ranged from poor planning to specific condemnation of individual participating instructors and topics selected for seminar consideration. The most general complaint was that the seminar did not fulfill its function of seeking to integrate knowledge through an interdisciplinary approach to a central problem of contemporary life. Topics were perceived as fragmented, often juvenile, and irrelevant. Furthermore, there were complaints concerning the perception that grades were assigned for the course which were not based upon the individual's performance during each segment or semester. Rather, grades were subjectively assigned based upon the student's attendance and the coordinator's personal evaluation of performance. Thus, the

students often neglected their preparation for the various topics assuming that it made little difference in terms of their grades.

Finally, while the program was designed for honor students, defined as students with a "B" average or better or an ACT score of 26 or more, there has been some relaxation of these requirements to permit other students to participate. Moreover, even though students may have had the necessary grades to participate in the program, there was a recognition on the part of other students that a grade from one instructor does not have the same implications or significance as the same grade from another instructor. Nevertheless, the one area where students were extremely vocal in their condemnation was with regard to other participants. Peer group evaluation can be almost inhuman. This condemnation was not a matter of simple or petty personality clashes among students, but it was a recognition by students of their respective mental or academic differences. On this point, moreover, there was little room for tolerance.

In summary, former honor students of Grand View College were extremely complimentary about the college in terms of its curriculum and instruction. They were, however, extremely critical of the "Three-Year Program for Superior Students" in terms of its academic orientation. The program, at best, was viewed as a means to an end -- the opportunity to spend one more year at GVC and benefit from its curricular offerings.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of significant conclusions emerged from this study which have many ramifications for the entire college. Primarily, they may be divided into two broad areas: the College and the Program.

The College. GVC has a number of very strong assets working on its behalf. The first thing to be considered is the fact that GVC has established itself as an educational institution of quality and excellence — a fact recognized by the community, the accrediting association, and the students. Beyond this fact, however, there must be a recognition that GVC has been able to maintain its Christian heritage through its commitment to the full development of the individual student as a human being. The concern for the individual has always been foremost in GVC thinking and, as a result, has helped to provide the college with its mark of distinction from so many similar institutions.

The second general conclusion to be drawn was that finances were an integral component of student participation in the honors program of the college. The financial aspect of higher education has been a central theme of the college for its entire history. Beyond that, however, GVC has existed with the thought that there has been more than one option for a person to do advanced study or even get a degree in the greater Des Moines environment. While GVC has served a specific economic segment of the community, which would have been intellectually poorer without the institution, it has been open to all students, irrespective of socio-economic backgrounds. In its own

way, GVC has been an educational "melting pot" for the community.

The Program. Although the effectiveness of the curricular and instructional program of Grand View College was rated very high by former honor students, it would appear that GVC needs to rethink its honors program. The academic background which the college has provided has been exceptionally good as attested to by the academic records of the transfer students. The college has done an outstanding job of preparing students for academic work at senior colleges and graduate schools.

This study began with the prophecy of David Starr Jordan to the effect that the "American college must give what the students want" (see p. 1). The time has come that the innovation of Grand View College has become passé. Whatever the past merits of the program, or even its crowning successes, the future demands even greater imagination and innovation to meet contemporary student needs and desires.

The alternatives are relatively few, but monumental. On the one hand, the college could keep the program either as it is or modify it to respond specifically to criticisms suggested by this study. On the other hand, the possibility exists that a more fundamental change could occur by either eliminating the program and reverting to simply a two-year institution OR, in view of what is currently happening in higher education, it could broaden the whole concept from an honors program to a three-year baccalaureate degree program, which would be open to all students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Since this study was designed to evaluate the program from the perspective of former participants, there was insufficient data to suggest which option would be the best for the institution to pursue. Nevertheless, there were some indications which could influence the future direction of the program and of the college. Although the ultimate decision regarding the honors program at GVC rests with the administration and trustees of the college, certain things appear sufficiently clear with regard to each of the foregoing alternatives to warrant a brief comment.

First, if the college were to keep the program as it is presently constituted, there is evidence that student dissatisfaction may have reached the point where student participation might in fact decline in favor of other programs at other institutions. While the data suggested only that former participants were dissatisfied with many of the internal programatic aspects such as structure and advising, verbal communications indicated varying degrees of hostility towards the program. Many of these more vocal individuals have openly expressed their reservations to faculty members and to other students -- especially potential participants in the program. Currently, the negative effect of this activity can be seen in the fact that between 1971 and 1973, the number of juniors remained the same (see Table 1). Furthermore, even though the number of participating departments has been increased, the faculty and administration have found it increasingly difficult to promote interest in the program.

From a faculty viewpoint, the program has also been limited as a result of at least two outside forces. The first is the growth of special programs at various universities based upon a "2 and 2" concept, whereby a student would do only 2 years at the junior college and must do the last 2 years at a senior institution. The second force has been the growth of concern regarding a three-year baccalaureate degree program. While the data indicated that students have begun to perceive some decline in the quality of instruction at GVC and the lack of administrative foresight in the area of academic excellence, many students have begun to question the viability of many courses currently offered in the GVC curriculum. Students have perceived that some institutions now offer a degree within three calendar years, and they therefore question the necessity of maintaining the arrangements GVC has traditionally had with its cooperating institutions.

Second, if the college were to modify the program to meet specific student criticisms, the institution would not only acknowledge the faults of the program, but would also destroy, in part, the original concept of an honors program. The further lowering of the grade point average, for example, would decrease the academic quality of the participants as a whole, and many of the better students would simply not waste their time participating. Similarly, the development of a more coherent theme for the seminar, while highly desirable, places an additional burden on the coordinator and the participating faculty members to prepare segments which lend themselves to relevant and meaningful interdisciplinary study. Given present teaching loads

and levels of compensation, the human cost factor becomes unmeasurable. Furthermore, such specific modifications would perpetuate a system of serving only a small fraction of the college's clientele (approximately 3 percent, according to Table 1).

Third, reversion to a junior college would be impractical because of the extremely competitive marketplace which currently exists in the greater Des Moines environment. As simply a two-year institution, GVC has very little to offer the student which could not be obtained at the nearby community college for a reduced cost. In fact, reversion to a junior college could threaten the very existence of the institution from the viewpoint of the community as well as of the student constituency it professes to serve.

Fourth, expansion of the college from a two-year institution to a three-year degree-granting institution appears to have the greatest positive value for Grand View College at this time. The radical nature of this alternative, however, presupposes a willingness and desire on the part of the faculty, administration, and trustees to totally redefine the role and purposes of the college. As has been demonstrated earlier, the present program has served an extremely small percentage of the students effectively; however, there are many indicators that this percentage may become even smaller in the future.

This study was not designed to test whether or not non-three year students would be able to complete such degree requirements in the future under such an arrangement. However, the premises on which this type of program have been founded have been well summarized by Dr. Virginia Smith, Associate Director of the Carnegie Commission, before

the AAHE's Southeast Regional Council meeting in May, 1972, and may be applicable to the situation at GVC:

> *Many students entering college are better prepared than ever before.
>
> *There is considerable duplication of work between high school and college.
>
> *There is nothing sacred about the four-year degree.
>
> *There is increased learning outside the classroom made possible by increased technology.
>
> *Education should be continued throughout life and not just during a person's youth (AAHE, pp. 7 & 8.)

The evaluation of GVC and its honors program contained in this study indicated that the college has achieved a high degree of excellence in terms of its ability to provide an education to students. Moreover, that excellence was ascribed to the college not just by former students, but by other academic institutions and the regional accrediting association. GVC, like many other institutions of higher learning, has begun to experience the type of student which Dr. Smith referred to in her comments. The question is whether or not the institution is willing to adapt itself to a new age.

With that thought in mind, the comments of Dr. David T. Kelly, associate executive secretary, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, made at the same AAHE regional conference, warrant attention:

> There is nothing in the accreditation standards that prohibits three-year degrees or two-year degrees or any-year degrees. . . . There is only a requirement for "an orderly progression of

> learning from basic studies to advanced studies." . . . . Accrediting agencies are concerned with the quality and competence of graduates produced but do not seek to dictate the means to such ends (AAHE, 1972, p. 8).

Furthermore, these comments echo earlier sentiments of Stephen Spurr, writing for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education:

> Degree structures should be flexible enough to facilitate the student's finding a place in the system of higher education appropriate to his current interests and abilities. Additionally, he should have the opportunity of movement consonant with the development of his motivation, abilities, and performance . . . . We should define our system of higher education in terms of academic degree structures so that each becomes a natural part of a fluid and interconnecting system. Our aim should be to keep our degree structures broadly defined so as to facilitate the movement of the student within the system and to bring him as close as possible in accordance with his potentialities (1970, pp. 21 & 23).

While the data in this study in no way provided a comprehensive endorsement of any of these alternatives, it did provide some meaningful insight into the current state of academic affairs at GVC. The first and most fundamental fact to be reckoned with was that regardless of the specific factors involved, the "Three-Year Program for Superior Students" at GVC has not been as successful as it had hoped to be, <u>from the perspective of the past participants of the program</u>. While the fact is incontestable that GVC honor students have done well at other institutions (according to their academic records), there was not sufficient institutional data to permit a comparison between these students and the average two-year student.

Therefore, in light of candid conversations with former honor students combined with an awareness of affairs in higher education

today, the specific recommendations of this study may be summarized as follows:

1. Establish a new degree program designed to permit the better qualified student to complete the general requirements for a baccalaureate degree within three years. The degree program would replace the present honors program and would significantly strengthen the general position of the college, both academically and financially.

2. In the establishment of the degree program, requirements should be established by the individual departments rather than by the college to permit the more fluid development of the individual consonant with individual goals and aims.

3. Encourage student and faculty criticism of the college and its programs to permit constant evolution in the area of academic excellence. Specifically, the college should avoid a policy of tenure which would prevent its removing unqualified or non-performing faculty members.

4. Heed the warning offered by Dr. Richard Peterson for the future of the institution:

> It seems essential in these times that colleges articulate their goals: to give direction to present and future work; to provide an ideology that can nurture internal cooperation, communication, and trust; to enable appraisal of the institution as a means-end system; to afford a basis for public understanding and support. Indeed, the college without the inclination or will to define itself, to chart a course for itself, can look forward either to no future - - to a kind of half-life of constantly responding to shifting pressures -- or to a future laid down by some external authority. Neither prospect pleases (1970, p. 11).

What ever future exists for Grand View College is of its own design. The basic question for GVC and other institutions like it is: Does the present administration and faculty possess the individual and collective commitment to make it better than it is?

GRAND VIEW COLLEGE

1200 GRANDVIEW AVENUE DES MOINES, IOWA 50316

AREA CODE 515/265-4232

A COLLEGE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

APPENDIX A

August 25, 1972

Dear Registrar:

I am a doctoral fellow at Walden University and an assistant professor of political science at Grand View College.

My dissertation for Walden University is an evaluation of the Three-Year Honor's Program which has become a distinguishing feature of Grand View College. One of the primary indicators of success is the student's success at his or her transfer institution.

I would appreciate it if you would please furnish the information requested on the enclosed forms and return them to me in the enclosed prepaid envelope. If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 265-4232 (office) or 266-8910 (home).

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

James C. Etchison
Research Project Director

Enclosure
JCE:rm

August 1972

Dear Registrar:

Our records indicate that _____ whose number is _____, transferred to your institution in the Fall of 19___. In an attempt to do a follow-up study of our three-year graduates, would you please supply us with the following information?

1. Did this student complete his or her degree requirements within two semesters of enrolling in your institution? Yes___ No___

2. If not, how long did it take and is there any indication as to why the delay occurred?

   Reasons for delay: 1. Illness ____
   2. Draft ____
   3. Change in major ____
   4. Other ____

3. For each of the semesters that this tudent attended your institution, how many hours did he or she carry and what was the gpa each of those semesters?

Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3
hours ____	hours ____	hours ____
gpa ____	gpa ____	gpa ____

4. What was this student's cummulative GPA at the time of graduation?

_____
Registrar

GRAND VIEW COLLEGE

1200 GRANDVIEW AVENUE DES MOINES, IOWA 50316

AREA CODE 515/265-4232

A COLLEGE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

APPENDIX B

September 1972

Dear GVC Alumnus:

Many of you already know me; however, for those who do not, a brief introduction is necessary. I am an assistant professor of political science at Grand View and also a Doctoral candidate in education at Walden University. As my dissertation is an evaluation of the three-year program at Grand View College, it is necessary for me to call upon you for your assistance.

Enclosed you will find a short questionnaire and answer sheet regarding some of your experiences at GVC and at your transfer institution. I would appreciate a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire and then return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

All responses will be held in strictest confidence. You need not identify yourself on the answer sheet. I have coded your name on the return envelope which will be destroyed as soon as all responses have been made. It is simply a check to see which of you have not responded.

I think the directions on the questionnaire are self-explanatory; however, if questions arise, please feel free to call me anytime at either 265-4232 (office) or 266-8910 (home).

If I get quick and unanimous response from all of you, the results should be ready this spring at the college for any of you who are interested.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. Etchison
Research Project Coordinator

Enclosure
JCE:rm

DIRECTIONS: Mark the appropriate position on the answer sheet for each response you select from the following choices:

1. disagree 3. undecided 5. agree DO NOT USE NUMBERS 2 & 4

FOR EXAMPLE: If you agree with the statement, blacken the fifth space on the answer sheet. NOTE that the spaces for answers are arranged consecutively across the answer sheet rather than down. Also mark the area for sex on the answer sheet. DO NOT FILL IN YOUR NAME.

SERVICES OF FACULTY ADVISORS AT GVC

1. Were you adequately advised by the faculty at GVC regarding transfer of courses to the four-year college that you attended?

2. At GVC, were you ever advised by faculty advisors to take courses which were unnecessary for your major at the four-year college to which you transferred?

3. Would you say that your GVC advisor was knowledgeable about your major?

4. Was the only time you ever consulted with your faculty advisor at GVC during registration to obtain a signature for the forms?

5. Would you say that your faculty advisor was well-informed regarding the necessary courses needed for your major at the four-year institutions?

6. Would you say that your faculty advisor at GVC was more helpful than the one you had at the four-year college?

INSTRUCTION

7. Did your background at GVC give you a good background for completing your major?

8. Did you pursue the same major at the four-year college?

9. Would you say that the Three-Year program does an excellent job of preparing students for transfer to the four-year college?

10. Did you find the courses at the four-year institution more time consuming?

11. Would you agree that the grading at GVC is tougher than at the four-year level?

12. Would you agree that the quality of instruction at GVC is higher than at the four-year college?

13. Would you say that you found more personal interest from the instructors at GVC than at the four-year institution?

14. Would you say there is a friendlier atmosphere at GVC than at the four-year college?

15. Do you feel that your instructors at GVC were well qualified and compared favorably to the instructors at the four-year college?

16. Did you find that your instructors at GVC were always willing and available for help?

CURRICULUM

17. Were the courses offered at GVC sufficient to meet the general requirements at the college to which you transferred?

18. Was the content of the courses offered at GVC sufficient to give you a good basic background for the courses which you took at the four-year college?

19. Would you say that you had no difficulty in transferring any of your courses to the four-year college?

20. Did you take some courses at GVC which were not required at the four-year college?

21. Did GVC do an excellent job of preparing you for your major?

22. Do you think that GVC has a well-planned course sequence?

23. Do you agree that you had no problems, either socially or academically, at the four-year college to which you transferred?

THREE-YEAR PROGRAM

24. Would you say that you benefited from participating in the three-year program?

25. Would you agree that the weekly seminars were everything you had anticipated?

26. Did you get very much out of the seminars?

27. Did you try to encourage fellow students to enter the three-year program after you had had the experience?

28. If you had it to do all over again, would you still enter the three-year program?

29. Was it primarily for academic reasons that you entered the three-year program?

30. Did financial considerations enter into your decision to enter the three-year program?

31. Since the three-year program is designed to permit you to finish your degree within a year of your transfer, were you able to complete your degree within one year?

32. Do you think that a student's grade point average should be the primary criterion for admission to the three-year program?

33. Do you think the three-year program should be expanded to include more students?

34. Did participation in the three-year program give you special status among faculty and administration at your transfer school?

APPENDIX C

	Total			Male			Female			Grad.			Part.			M.Gr.			F.Gr.			M.Pt.			F.Pt.		
	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5	1	3	5
1	8	4	22	4	1	10	4	3	12	4	2	18	4	2	4	1	1	9	3	1	9	3	0	1	1	2	3
2	19	5	10	7	4	4	12	1	6	13	4	7	6	1	3	4	3	4	9	1	3	3	1	0	3	0	3
3	7	4	23	1	2	12	6	2	11	6	2	16	1	2	7	0	1	10	6	1	6	1	1	2	0	1	5
4	21	1	12	11	0	4	10	1	8	17	0	7	4	1	5	10	0	1	7	0	6	1	0	3	3	1	2
5	11	9	14	2	5	8	9	4	6	8	6	10	3	3	4	1	3	7	7	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	3
6	13	12	9	4	5	6	9	7	3	6	10	8	7	2	1	1	4	6	5	6	2	3	1	0	4	1	1
7	2	3	29	2	3	10	0	0	19	2	2	20	0	1	9	2	2	7	0	0	13	0	1	3	0	0	6
8	3	0	31	3	0	12	0	0	19	3	0	21	0	0	10	3	0	8	0	0	13	0	0	4	0	0	6
9	2	14	18	1	9	5	1	5	13	2	11	11	0	3	7	1	6	4	1	5	7	0	3	1	0	0	6
10	6	7	11	7	3	5	9	4	6	12	6	6	4	1	5	6	3	2	6	3	4	1	0	3	3	1	2
11	9	3	12	3	6	6	6	7	6	6	8	10	3	5	2	3	3	5	3	5	5	0	3	1	3	2	1
12	6	21	7	1	9	5	5	12	2	4	14	6	2	8	0	1	5	5	3	8	2	0	4	0	2	4	0
13	3	6	25	0	4	11	3	2	14	2	4	18	1	2	7	0	2	9	2	2	9	0	2	2	1	0	5
14	3	5	26	0	2	13	3	3	13	3	5	16	0	0	10	0	2	9	3	3	7	0	0	4	0	0	6
15	1	4	29	1	2	12	0	2	17	1	2	21	0	2	8	1	1	9	0	1	12	0	1	3	0	1	5
16	0	3	31	0	1	14	0	2	17	0	0	24	0	3	7	0	0	11	0	0	13	0	1	3	0	2	4
17	3	4	27	3	3	9	0	1	18	2	2	20	1	2	7	2	2	7	0	0	13	1	1	2	0	1	5
18	3	2	29	2	1	12	1	1	17	2	1	21	1	1	8	2	0	9	0	1	12	0	1	3	1	0	5
19	10	1	23	6	0	9	4	1	14	7	1	16	3	0	7	5	0	6	2	1	10	1	0	3	2	0	4
20	8	1	25	3	1	11	5	0	14	4	1	19	4	0	6	2	1	8	2	0	11	1	0	3	3	0	3
21	3	10	21	2	6	7	1	4	14	3	4	17	0	6	4	2	3	6	1	1	11	0	3	1	0	3	3
22	3	12	19	3	6	6	0	6	13	1	9	14	2	3	5	1	5	5	0	4	9	2	1	1	0	2	4
23	6	6	22	5	4	6	1	2	16	6	4	14	0	2	8	5	3	3	1	1	11	0	1	3	0	1	5
24	2	3	29	2	2	11	0	1	18	2	3	19	0	0	10	2	2	7	0	1	12	0	0	4	0	0	6
25	17	10	7	8	3	4	9	7	3	11	7	6	6	3	1	6	2	3	5	5	3	2	1	1	4	2	0
26	9	10	15	4	6	5	5	4	10	7	5	12	2	5	3	3	4	4	4	1	8	1	2	1	1	3	2
27	5	1	28	3	0	12	2	1	16	5	0	19	0	1	9	3	0	8	2	0	11	0	0	4	0	1	5
28	4	9	21	2	6	7	2	3	14	3	9	12	2	0	8	2	6	3	1	3	9	0	0	4	1	0	5
29	23	6	5	12	1	2	11	5	3	16	3	5	7	3	0	9	0	2	7	3	3	3	1	0	4	2	0
30	2	0	32	2	0	13	0	0	19	2	0	22	0	0	10	2	0	9	0	0	13	0	0	4	0	0	6
31	4	7	23	1	4	10	3	3	13	3	5	16	1	2	7	1	3	7	2	2	9	0	1	3	1	1	4
32	16	12	6	8	4	3	8	8	3	13	7	4	3	5	2	6	3	2	7	4	2	2	1	1	1	4	1
33	0	10	24	0	5	10	0	5	14	0	7	17	0	3	7	0	3	8	0	4	9	0	2	2	0	1	5
34	20	5	9	8	2	5	12	3	4	5	2	7	5	3	2	7	0	4	8	2	3	1	2	1	4	1	1

1 disagree

3 uncertain

5 agree

APPENDIX D

HONORS SEMINAR TOPICS FOR THE FIRST SEMESTER, 1969-70

THEME: Critical Issues of 20th Century America

	TOPIC	FACULTY CONSULTANT	DATES
1.	Relationship of Higher Education to the Church	Dr. Ernest Nielsen	Last week of Sept., 1st 2 weeks of Oct.
2.	The Population Explosion and Family Control	Wilber Williamson	Last 3 wks. of Oct.
3.	Historigraphy and the New Left Historians	Steve Rye	1st 3 weeks of Nov.
4.	Conflict in Current Models of the Universe	Dick Simpson	1st 3 weeks of Dec.
5.	God, Hope, and the Future	Don Zinger	1st 3 weeks of Jan.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. The class will meet for one 2-hour class period per week (15 weeks)

b. Each student will prepare and present a report on one assigned topic.

c. All students will also be assigned readings for backgroumd information concerning the other topics of the Seminar.

c. All students will be expected to participate in the discussion of the topics during the class period.

HONORS SEMINAR TOPICS FOR THE SECOND SEMESTER, 1969-70

THREE-YEAR PROGRAM

THEME: Critical Issues of 20th Century America

TOPIC	FACULTY CONSULTANT	DATES
1. Environmental Pollution	Jessen-Strasser	Feb. 12, 19, 26
2. Censorship in Communication's Media	Noyes-Dickson	March 5, 12, 19
3. Individual Rights & Social Order	Bodtker	April 2, 9, 16
4. Language: Form & Thought	Hvistendahl	April 23, 30 and May 7
5. Introduction to the Concept of Liberty	Madden	May 14, 21, 28

(Note: The scheduled time period for the Honors Seminar is from 3 to 5 P.M., Thursday afternoons. This schedule is subject to change, however.)

RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. The class will meet for one 2-hour period each week. (15 weeks)

b. Each student will prepare and present a report on one assigned topic.

c. All students will also be assigned readings for background information concerning the other topics of the Seminar.

c. All students will be expected to participate in the discussion of the topics during the class period.

HONORS SEMINAR TOPICS FOR THE FIRST SEMESTER

THREE-YEAR PROGRAM, 1970-71

THEME: Critical Issues of 20th Century America

TOPIC	FACULTY CONSULTANT	DATES
1. The College and Student	Dr. Nielsen	Sept. 24, Oct. 1 & 8
2. Territoriality and Human Behavior	T. Rider	Oct. 15, 22, 29
3. The Sexual Revolution	W. Williamson	Nov. 5, 12, 20
4. Dissent and Nazi Germany	R. Thill	Dec. 3, 10, 17
5. Concept of Liberty	R. Madden	Jan. 7, 14, 21

(Note) The scheduled time period for the Honors Seminar is from 3 to 5 p.m., Thursday afternoons. This schedule is subject to change, however.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. The class will meet for one 2-hour period each week. (15 weeks)

b. All students will be responsible for the assigned readings concerning each of the topics for the Seminar.

c. All students will be expected to participate in the discussion of the topics during the class period.

c. If a student misses a Seminar discussion, a written report on the appropriate topic will be expected.

HONORS SEMINAR

SCHEDULE, SECOND SEMESTER, 1970-71

TOPIC	FACULTY CONSULTANT	DATES
1. Theatre of the Absurd	Noyes & Dickson	Feb. 4, 11, 18
2. Role of the Alienated in America	Etchison	Feb. 25, March 4, and 11
3. A Look at the Drug Scene	Doidge	March 18, 25 and April 1
4. Art and the Expression of our Times	Engler	April 19, 22, 29
5. The Appeal of Zen Buddhism	Zinger	May 6, 13, 20

(Note: The scheduled time period for the Honors Seminar is from 3 to 5 p.m., Thursday afternoons. Place: 2nd floor, Library.)

RESPONSIBILITIES:

a. The class will meet for one 2-hour period each week. (15 weeks)

b. All students will be responsible for the assigned readings concerning each of the topics of the Seminar.

c. All students will be expected to participate in the discussion of the topics during the class period.

d. If a student misses a Seminar period, a written report on the appropriate topic will be expected.

SUBJECT: Schedule, Honors Seminar, Fall Semester, 1971-72

TO: Faculty and Students Involved in the Honors Seminar

The following list of topics has been arranged for the Seminar for this fall semester. Because of the size of the group, the Seminar will be divided into two sections on certain occasions. One section will meet from 3-5 p.m., Tuesdays, and the other section will meet from 3-5 p.m., Thursdays.

TOPIC LEADER		
1. Mrs. Barbara Bell	What Libraries Can Do For You	Sept. 16, 23, 30
2. Mr. Charles Jacobsen	Soft America and Physical Fitness	Oct. 7, 14
3. Dr. Ernest Nielsen	Significant Trends in Higher Education	Oct. 21, 28
4. Mrs. Pat Stone	The Rhetoric of Agitation	Nov. 4, 11, 18
5. Mr. Douglas Kachel	The American Indians - Minority	Dec. 2, 9, 16

Wilber Williamson
Coordinator

January 24, 1972

SUBJECT: Schedule for the Honors Seminar, Spring Semester, 1971-1972

TO: Faculty Leaders and Students Involved in the Honors Seminar

The following list of topics has been arranged for the Seminar for the Spring Semester. Generally the Seminar will meet in the Grand View Library from 3 - 5 p.m., Thursdays, unless special circumstances dictate otherwise.

TOPIC LEADER	TOPIC	DATES
1. Mr. Don Sondrol	The Jesus Movement	Feb. 3, 10, 17
2. Mrs. M. Wilkinson	Inflation and Cost of Living	Feb. 24, Mar. 2
3. Dr. W. Lunden	Prisons and Rehabilitation	Mar. 9, 16, 23
4. Mr. W. Williamson	Abortions-Pros and Cons	Apr. 6, 13, 20
5. Mr. Etchison and Hansen	Presidential Election	Apr. 27, May 4, and 11

Wilber J. Williamson

Coordinator

TOPIC ASSIGNMENTS - HONORS SEMINAR

FALL SEMESTER 1972

PLACE: Seminar Room, Second Floor, Grand View College, Library

TIME: Thursday afternoons, 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

DATE	TOPIC	LEADER
Sept. 7	Orientation and Assignment	W. Williamson
Sept. 14, 21	Better Use of the Library	Mrs. Burns and Mrs. Rye
Sept. 28, Oct. 5, 12	Aiding Abnormal and Handicapped Children	Mrs. J. Park
Oct. 19, 26	The Nature of the Presidency and the Election	S. Rye
Nov. 2, 9, and 16	Art Project and Study	J. Engler
Nov. 30, Dec. 7, 14	The Indian and Mexican Minorities	D. Kachel

REFERENCES

American Association for Higher Education. College and University Bulletin. Vol. 24, No. 16; June 1, 1972, 7-8.

American College Testing Program, Inc. Monograph Two: The Two-Year College and Its Students. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, Inc., 1969.

American Institute for Research. Evaluative Research: Strategies and Methods. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: American Institute for Research, 1970.

Anderson, John E. jr. "Research in the Junior College: Anathema or Anodyne?" in the Junior College Journal, 1964, 35, 15-16.

Astin, Alexander W. "Evaluative Research and the New Colleges," in Paul L. Dressel (ed.) The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, Inc. 1971.

Astin, Alexander W. and Lee, Calvin B. T. The Invisible Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Baskin, Samuel. "A Conceptual Framework for Institutional Research: Three Points of View," in A Conceptual Framework for Institutional Research. Pullman, Washington: Washington State University, Office of Institutional Research, 1964.

Berte, Neal R. (ed.) Innovations in Undergraduate Education: Selected Institutional Profiles and Thoughts About Experimentalism. Report of conference in January, 1971, co-sponsored by New College of the University of Alabama and the National Science Foundation.

Blocker, Clyde E.; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bolman, Frederick W. "New Opportunities in Articulation," in the Junior College Journal, 1966, 37, 20-23.

Brawer, Florence B. Values and the Generation Gap: Junior College Freshmen and Faculty. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971, no. 11.

Brick, Michael and McGrath, Earl J. Innovation in Liberal Arts Colleges. N.Y.: Institute of Higher Education by the Teachers Press, Columbia University, 1969.

Bright, B. Louis. "The New Mechanics and the Old Junior College," in B. Lamar Johnson (ed.) The Experimental Junior College. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, January, 1968, 23-28.

Brumbaugh, A. J. Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Office of Statistical Information and Research, 1960.

Canfield, Albert A. "Time for Instructional Research," in the Junior College Review, 2, 1967.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, January, 1971.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, June, 1970.

Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverley Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Cohen, Joseph W. (ed.) The Superior Student in American Higher Education. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Cowley, W. H. "Two and a Half Centuries of Institutional Research," in College Self-Study: Lectures on Institutional Research. Boulder, Colorado: The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1960.

Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968

Cross, K. Patricia. "The Role of the Junior College in Providing Post-secondary Education for All," in the U.S. Office of Education's Trends in Postsecondary Education. Washington, D.C.

Cross, K. Patricia. "When Will Research Improve Education?" in The Research Reporter, 2 (4), 1967.

Dressel, Paul L. (ed.) The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1971.

Dressel, Paul L. and Associates. Evaluation in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Dressel, Paul L. and DeLisle, Francis H. Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Drewry, Galen N. The Instructional Process and Institutional Research. Claremont, California: The Association for Institutional Research, 1967, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research.

Emrick, Raymond T. An Institutional Research for the Purpose of Measuring the Effectiveness of Instructional, Curricular, and Personnel Services to the Transfer Students at Olney Central College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, 1972.

Fincher, Cameron (ed.) The Challenge and Response of Institutional Research. Claremont, California: The Association for Institutional Research, 1970. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research.

Fischer, John H. (chairman) Conference on Educational Accountability. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1971.

Folger, J. K. "How Can Institutional Research Facilitate Continuous Planning and Progressive Change Required for our Colleges?" in Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1961.

Garrison, Roger H. "Private Junior Colleges: The Question is Survival," in The Junior College Journal, 39 (6), 1969, 35-38.

Gleazer, E. J. jr. "An Introduction to Junior Colleges," in American Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967, 7th ed., 3-60.

Gott, Richard H. Junior Colleges into Four-Year College: Rationale and Result in Two Institutions. Berkeley: University of California, 1968.

Grand View College Bulletin (Catalog) 1972-1974. Des Moines, Iowa: Grand View College, 1972.

Hansen, Thorvald. We Laid Foundation Here. . . . Des Moines, Iowa: Grand View College, 1972.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1958.

Hungate, Thad L. and McGrath, Earl J. A New Trimester Three-Year Degree Program. N.Y.: Institute of Higher Education by the Bureau of Publications of Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. "Institutional Research and the Instructional Process," in Galen N. Drewry (ed.) The Instructional Process and Institutional Research. Claremont, California: the Association for Institutional Research, 1967. Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research.

Johnson, B. Lamar. "Encouraging Innovation in Teaching," in the Junior College Journal, 39, 1969a.

Johnson, B. Lamar. Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community Colleges. Beverley Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969b.

Johnson, George H. "The Purpose of Evaluation and the Role of the Evaluator," in American Institute for Research. Evaluative Research: Strategies and Methods. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: AIR, 1970, 1-18.

Jordan, David Starr. The Trend of the American University. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1929.

Keeton, Morris T. Models and Mavericks. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Kintzer, Frederick C. "Articulation is an Opportunity," in the Junior College Journal, 37, 1967, 16-19.

Kintzer, Frederick C. Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation. Topical Paper no. 15. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, University of California, 1970.

Kirk, Grayson. "College Shouldn't Take Four Years," in the Saturday Evening Post, March 26, 1960, 21.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "Focus on the Transfer Program," in the Junior College Journal, 35, 1965, 5-9.

Knoell, Dorothy M. and Medsker, Leland L. Articulation Between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges. Cooperative Research no. 2167. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1964a.

Knoell, Dorothy M. and Medsker, Leland L. From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1965.

Knoell, Dorothy M. and Medsker, Leland L. Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two-and Four-Year Colleges: With Implications for Coordination and Articulation. Cooperative Research Project no. 1133. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1964b.

Lieberman, M. "An Overview of Accountability," in the Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 1970, 194-195.

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. Educational Strategies for Social Change. Papers and Proceedings of the 56th Annual Convention, January 10-11, 1970.

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. Resources for the Future. Papers and Proceedings of the 57th Annual Convention, February 3-5, 1971.

McGrath, Earl J. "The Junior College in the Next Ten Years," address delivered at the Council of North Central Junior Colleges at Kansas City, Missouri, October 24, 1955.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Medsker, Leland L. and Tillery, Dale. Breaking the Access Barriers. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Medsker, Leland L. and Trent, J.W. The Influence of Different Types of Public Higher Institutions on College Attendance from Varying Socioeconomic Ability Levels. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1965.

Montgomery, James R. "Institutional Research -- A Future Unfolding," in Galen N. Drewry (ed.) The Instructional Process and Institutional Research. Claremont, California: The Association for Institutional Research, 1967.

Nelson, James H. "Guidelines for Articulation," in the Junior College Journal, 36, 1966, 24-26.

Nielsen, Ernest D. "A Challenging Opportunity: An Action Program," unpublished paper, January 29, 1958.

Nielsen, Ernest D. "The Church's Concept of Grand View College Through the Years," address delivered at the last Pastors' Institute of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, April 25, 1962. Des Moines, Iowa.

Nielsen, Ernest D. Public address to the Iowa Synod, Lutheran Church in America, March 23, 1966.

Nielsen, Ernest D. "The Three Year Plan," Paper submitted to the faculty and Board of Directors of Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa, August 10, 1962.

O'Connor, Thomas J. Follow-up Studies in Junior Colleges: A Tool for Institutional Improvement. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.

Palola, Ernest G. and Padgett, William. Planning for Self-Renewal. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

Pattillo, Manning M. jr. and MacKenzie, Donald M. Church-Sponsored Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Use of Institutional Goals. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service; report no. 5, October, 1970.

Roueche, John E. "Gaps and Overlaps in Institutional Research," in the Junior College Journal, 38, 1967, 20-23.

Roueche, John E.; Baker, George A. III; and Brownell, Richard L. Accountability and the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, January, 1971.

Roueche, John E. and Boggs, John R. "Needed Research in the Junior College," in the Junior College Research Review, 2, 1968a.

Roueche, John E. and Boggs, John R. Junior College Institutional Research: The State of the Art. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968b.

Roueche, John E.; McFarlane, William H.; and Herrscher, Barton R. The Private Junior College: Prospects for the 1970's. Durham, North Carolina: National Laboratory for Higher Education, 1971.

Sanford, Nevitt. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Saupe, Joe L. "Assessing Program Quality," in Cameron Fincher (ed.) The Challenge and Response of Institutional Research. Claremont, California: AIR, 1970.

Sievert, William A. "College Honors Pr[illegible] Accused of Elitism, Facing Crises," in the Chronicle of Higher Education, 7 (6), 1972, 1 & 5.

Sobol, Thomas. "The Broader Meaning of Articulation," in the Phi Delta Kappan, 3, 1971.

Spencer, Lyle M. "A Publisher Looks at Innovation," in Invitational National Seminar on the Experimental Junior College, jointly sponsored by UCLA Junior College Leadership Program and Science Research Associates, Inc., Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates, 1967.

Spurr, Stephen H. Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Starrak, James A. and Hughes, Raymond M. The New Junior College. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1948.

Stickler, W. Hugh. "The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges," in the Junior College Journal, 31, 1961, 542-548.

Swanson, Herbert Leland. "An Investigation of Institutional Research in the Junior Colleges of the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, School of Education, 1965, 180-183.

Thornton, James W. jr. The Community Junior College. N.Y.: John Wiley, 1966.

Van Istendal, Theodore G. "Community College Institutional Research," in Cameron Fincher (ed.) The Challenge and Response of Institutional Research. Claremont, California: AIR, 1970.

Visiting Committee. "Report of a Visit to Grand View College" made March 10 and 11, 1969 for the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Willingham, Warren W. "The Importance of Relevance in Expanding Postsecondary Education," in Trends in Postsecondary education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969.

Woodring, Paul. The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment. N.Y. McGraw-Hill, 1968.